

He. ecc.
454 h -2



BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS.

A
SUMMARY
OF
THE HISTORY
OF
THE ENGLISH CHURCH,
AND OF
THE SECTS
WHICH HAVE DEPARTED FROM ITS COMMUNION;
WITH
ANSWERS TO EACH DISSENTING BODY
RELATIVE TO ITS PRETENDED GROUNDS OF SEPARATION.

BY JOHNSON GRANT, M.A.
OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

VOL. II.
CARRYING DOWN THE NARRATIVE TO THE REIGN OF
CHARLES II.
AND INTRODUCING DISCUSSIONS OF
THE PRINCIPLES HELD BY PRESBYTERIANS, INDEPENDENTS,
ANTINOMIANS, MILLENARIANS, AND QUAKERS.

"It is not St. Augustine's, or St. Ambrose's works, that will make so wise
a divine, as ecclesiastical history, thoroughly read and observed."—
LORD BACON.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD,
BOOKSELLER TO THE QUEEN, NO. 190, PICCADILLY.
1814.

THE HISTORY
OF THE
CHURCH
OF ENGLAND
FROM THE
REFORMATION
TO THE
PRESENT
TIME
WITH
ANSWERS TO EACH
DISSENTING BODY
RELATIVE TO ITS
PRINCIPAL GROUNDS OF
OBJECTION

BY
JOHN G. GRANT, M.A.
OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

VOLUME II
CONTAINING
THE HISTORY OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
FROM THE
REFORMATION
TO THE
PRESENT
TIME
WITH
ANSWERS TO EACH
DISSENTING BODY
RELATIVE TO ITS
PRINCIPAL GROUNDS OF
OBJECTION

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

S. Gosnell, Printer,
Little Queen Street, London.

P R E F A C E

TO THE SECOND VOLUME.

FOR the long interval which has elapsed since the publication of my former volume, I have several satisfactory reasons to assign. To some minds it would, perhaps, be sufficient to state, that by the loss of the best of mothers and firmest of friends, I was nearly disabled for one whole year from bending my mind to any laborious pursuit. I might also plead vexation, arising from particular circumstances connected with this painful event ; ill health, and the necessity laid upon me of directing attention to objects of a different description. The labour also, requisite in preparing the volume now presented, has been far greater than many can readily imagine ; greater than, perhaps, I shall obtain credit for ; and such, I am confident, as no praise or emolument I am likely to receive, will ever adequately remunerate.

It is, however, more important that I should

explain to the Public the occasion of my departure from the original proposal of comprising the work within the space of two volumes. This I fully intended to accomplish at the time when the former part of my History was sent forth; but suggestions imparted by individuals of high eminence and respectability, could not well be disobeyed. It is in compliance with these suggestions that I have introduced the two treatises, on Church Government, and on the Quinquarticular Controversy; which were no more than short sketches in the original manuscript; and that I purpose annexing an Index, a Chronological Table, and a general View of the present State of the English Church, to that part of the History which is yet to appear. As the Unitarians and Methodists, however, are the only two remaining sects, demanding a very extended consideration, and as the ecclesiastical history of England, after the restoration of Charles II. presents, comparatively, few details to the pen of the historian, the work can very easily be comp' ted in a Supplemental Volume.

From this alteration in the plan, I cannot help flattering myself, that considerable benefit has been

derived. There are certain topics, which it were better not to treat at all, than to dismiss with a superficial consideration. Of this description is a polemical discussion of the principles maintained by any distinguished religious body. The argument must be sifted, if possible, to the bottom; for, otherwise, the advocate will only strengthen the cause of his adversary, by discovering the weakness of his own replies. To the Society, for whom this History was originally sketched, a Society composed exclusively of members of the church, short answers to the tenets of dissenting bodies might have been useful, as compendious recollections of their own stores of learning. But, now that I am come before the bar of the Public,—now that I am throwing myself, as it were, into an arena, where it is not improbable that the disciples of every religious school will consider themselves unfairly used, and may enter the lists against me, it seems necessary, for my own sake, as well as for that of the church which I defend, that I should endeavour to arm myself at all points. To drop the metaphor: had I restricted myself too much in room, I could only have skimmed slightly over a multiplicity of important themes, and presented the Public with

a paltry sketch. As it is, I am not without hopes, that I shall be found to have offered a production, satisfactory to some minds harassed by uncertainty, and not wholly discreditable to myself.

There is no epoch of church history, to which that maxim of Lord Bacon's, selected as the motto to this work, is more applicable, than to the period treated of in the present volume. During the reigns of the first James and Charles, and under the Protectorate, religion was politics, religion was pleasure, religion was occupation, religion was every thing. Almost every theological question was then ably and fully discussed; and to study these discussions, is to read treatises in Divinity. As a St. John's man, I have certainly felt an esprit de corps, in entering into an ample vindication of Archbishop Laud. It cost me more pains than many may conceive it to have merited: yet there are minds which will deem it not the least interesting part of the work. To vindicate the departed from unjust aspersions, is expedient for preserving the character of history as a register of truth. It is a pleasant labour of the judgment. It is an exercise of Christian benevolence. It is doing as we would be done unto,

important themes, and presented the Public with

The history of the Sealed People may not prove useless at a period when so much has been written, and so little understood, concerning the leader of this sect, and her followers. With all reasonable minds the letter of Dr. Sims is decisive: but that gentleman, the Editor of Variety, and other writers, are widely mistaken, in taking it for granted that we shall hear no more of this delusion. Has Southcott herself recanted? Has there been a single apostacy from her sect? Has the worthy, but deluded Miss Townly (whom I am sorry if I shall have here offended, in consequence of finding her in low and bad company); has Ann Underwood, deserted her? Has any one respectable adherent shown even a disposition to retract? Has Foley, Ash, Bradley, Tozer, or Owen? Was she not received, on her flight, into the house of a clergyman, beneficed in the church, and the brother of an English nobleman? Has Halhed blushed for his *Pater est quem nuptiæ demonstrant*? Has Mr. Wetherell, a man of unquestionable intelligence and probity, been convinced by Dr. Sims's report? No. He writes to me (Sept. 10th), of Mrs. Southcott's important mission; and it is absolutely necessary, he says, that a female of her age and

in her *situation* should be kept quiet and still, till medical aid is required.

Such being the case, I cannot help regretting, that Dr. Sims, the Editor of *Variety*, Mr. Cobbett, and other writers, have not perceived the mischief they are occasioning, in failing to represent this woman in her true colours, as a compound of delusion and artifice. It appears not that these gentlemen have been acquainted with her wretched publications; or, even in regard to the recent occurrence, that they have adverted to all the facts. The Third Book of Wonders, in which the expected birth was announced, is dated March 10th, 1814. It appears from the Fifth Book, that the symptoms of her uterine complaint had, about that time, begun to show themselves. Now, I willingly grant, that she may have worked up her diseased mind into the belief in a divine incubation. This is the FANATICAL and excusable part of the story. But observe the cunning with which she *then* travels back to the 13th of October in the preceding year; and relates a vision, predicting the birth, which she tells us, but not until the 10th of March, she had, at that early period, been favoured with. This is the ARTIFICE; which has not yet been properly exposed.

Neither are the disciples to be judged as merely deceived by the imagined pregnancy, or with reference to this isolated fact. That were little. They are dupes to the pretended prophecy, after an hundred instances of failure. Will these persons at once relinquish their delusions, and frankly acknowledge themselves to be fools? No; they will invent some key to the cypher, some quibble for interpreting the prediction! Like Mrs. M. they will forgive the lie of "our spiritual mother;" and she will go on prophesying, and blaspheming, and deceiving, to the end of the chapter. I doubt not that she is, even at this moment, inditing some new Book of Wonders, and cunningly-devised fable*.

* As my account of this sect was written amidst the heat of the battle, one or two inaccuracies may have escaped my pen. I am, in particular, desirous of correcting the medical report. Eleven medical men were, in fact, assembled. The following statement will, I believe, represent the truth.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. Owen | } To be set aside as biassed, being sealed people. |
| 2. Mr. Walker | |
| 3. Mr. Wetherell | |
| 4. Dr. Sims | Denied the pregnancy. |
| 5. Dr. Adams | Not satisfied. |
| 6. Mr. Mealing | Ditto. |
| 7. Dr. Walshman | } Left the house without seeing the woman, who refused consent to the examination they insisted on. |
| 8. Mr. Horff | |

It will, I am aware, appear incongruous to introduce such names as Southcott and Huntington under so early a period of history as the Commonwealth; but, while it is recollected, that, according to my original plan, the accounts of the sects are intended only as episodes, and that the Church History is the main thread of the narrative, it will be evident, that unless this mode of treatment had been adopted, I could not have exhibited a connected view of any one religious body, preparatory to reasoning against its principles.

In preparing the part of my History now sent forth into the world, I have found my dissenting brethren, with whom I have had occasion to communicate, to be gentlemen, scholars, and sincere Christians: and I should make but an ill return

-
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 9. Dr. Reece..... | } Inadvertently lent their names to the
delusion. |
| 10. Mr. Foster | |
| 11. Mr. Hopjay | |

I am happy that my book comes forth before the expected catastrophe, that I may not be numbered with those who rest the character of the woman, and the pretensions of her sect, on the issue of this gossip's story. What signifies it whether an infant or an uterine disorder lie hidden in the womb of a wretched blasphemer? There are more than sufficient grounds for being satisfied beforehand, that her whole art and mystery is an infamous deception.

for the promptitude, liberality, and kindness, with which they have satisfied my various interrogatories, if I here failed to express my deep regret for any passage which may be written in a spirit of unchristian asperity, or calculated to hurt their feelings beyond what fair argument requires. For every denomination whose principles tend to encourage Christian morality, I entertain the most sincere and profound respect *.

* Too late to be noticed in the body of this volume, my attention was directed by Mr. Blair, of Great Russell Street, to a book which has recently been imported from the continent, entitled, "*Histoire des Sectes religieuses, &c. par M. Grégoire, ancien Evêque de Blois, &c.*"

I have only had time to peruse that chapter of the work, which treats concerning the present state of Protestantism; and I cannot suffer these sheets to meet the public eye, without exposing some few of its gross errors and unfair representations. It professes to be a continuation down to the present time, of Bossuet's celebrated work on the Variations of Protestants. The leading principle which its author seeks to establish is, that the Reformed religion has every where a tendency to Socinianism. With his statements relative to continental churches, it is not now my province to concern myself. I am anxious, however, to impress the minds of my countrymen with some faint notion of his curious assertions and reasonings, while describing the state of religion in England. We are told, p. 181, that the Protestants of the present age are conformed only in name to those of the sixteenth century: that Whitby was a Socinian, p. 488: that the Blagdon controversy respected an accusation of denying the Trinity levelled by Miss H. More, against

the curate of Blagdon, p. 190. We are told on the authority of Mr. On-dit, a notorious liar, that the Bishop of Lincoln has expelled the Athanasian creed from his chapel; that it has been expunged from plusieurs livres liturgiques, p. 191; and that Protestants dismiss doctrinal truths from their sermons, p. 205. We are told, that under Edward VI. twenty-four Articles of religion were published; and that Elizabeth, for the sake of further uniformity, added eleven more, p. 205; that there is a continual demand in our church for the reformation of the Liturgy, and that no person who signs the Articles yields them an entire assent; that many ministers, rejecting this profession of faith, have quitted their benefices to join the Dissenters, p. 208; that Protestants teach one thing and believe another, p. 214; that in England the holy books are treated avec licence, p. 248; that in Durham cathedral there are various Catholic rites, p. 260; that the Duke of Norfolk changed his religion to obtain a seat in parliament, p. 262; that the small number of Catholic priests who change their religion, come over to Protestantism as to a comedy which will end in marriage; and that very often an enlèvement takes precedence of the dénouement. Finally, we are informed, that instead of Addison, Lyttelton, and Sherlock, West, Lardner, and Paley, who have written on the evidences of Christianity; from the bosom of our communions, and from the pens of our ministers, at present only issue a vast multitude of works, in which, while some exterior forms of respect for sacred worship are preserved, the poison of incredulity is insinuated, and all the proofs of revealed truth are enfeebled. As a companion to this catalogue of marvellous verities, the Bishop of Blois has likewise sent us over some choice specimens of his liberal and logical inferences. To regret the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian creed, implies a rejection of its doctrines, and a tendency towards Socinianism, p. 187 and 191 *. To admit of altar-pieces, is to manifest an

* See Bishop of Lincoln's Elements, vol. ii. p. 222.

inclination for image-worship. The union of Protestants, as in the Missionary Society, is a proof of their lukewarmness, and indifference about their respective tenets, p. 254. The clergy in Scotland are divided into Orthodox and Moderés, and therefore into Orthodox and Socinians, p. 249.

Protestants, it seems, accuse Catholics of believing the infallibility of the Pope, p. 183. Protestants do no such thing. But Protestants accuse the Catholics of believing the doctrine of human infallibility, as residing somewhere in their church; and the Bishop of Blois himself confesses the fact. Again: "En matière de religion, le préjugé est pour ce qui est plus ancien; car la vérité est avant le mensonge. Il peut se faire qu'il y a des erreurs anciens; mais nous ne connoissons pas des vérités nouvelles." p. 268. Despicable sophistry! Who does not see that the Reformation is not a system of new truths, but a revival of old ones? Mr. Stone's preaching of Socinianism is also carefully recorded; but it is not added, that for this offence he was suspended from his clerical functions.

This precious chapter is wound up with the following prophecy: "Le Protestantisme ne reviendra jamais ce qu'il a été, et il ne peut rester ce qu'il est; une pente irresistible l'entraîne vers sa fin, ou il subira une nouvelle métamorphose; sa constitution même est le germe corrosif de son existence. Il aura donc le sort des toutes les sectes séparées de l'unité, que l'Eglise Catholique voit depuis dix huit siècles successivement s'élever, l'attaquer et s'écrouler autour d'elle; tandis que levant sa tête majestueuse au dessus des erreurs, des hérésies, et des schismes, dirigée par son divin Fondateur, elle marche à la consommation des siècles. Ces détails sont le résultat de recherches, et des conférences avec des savans distingués des divers commtinions, dont plusieurs sont mes amis."

Truly a handsome testimony of friendship!

The next time that Bishop Grégoire shall treat concerning the religious principles maintained in the Church of England, let him remember that Socinianism is by no means here in.

repute: and let him acknowledge (for he knows the fact) that there is much more concealed Deism lurking among the outward adherents to the Catholic church, one and indivisible, than there is of error and duplicity within the pale of the English establishment. Does he seek to remedy this evil? Let him give the people fewer absurdities to swallow.

J. G.

*Edgware Road,
September 28th, 1814.*

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION.

ON THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, AND THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND AS MODELLED ON IT.

- I. ON the various Meanings of the Word Church: Error of the Independents.—II. What is the Catholic Church? The visible and invisible Church.—III. The Requisites of the visible Church.—IV. On the primitive Church: and on episcopal as right and lawful Ordination.—V. On the Succession and Perpetuity of the Christian Ministry.—VI. On a true Church: and who are excluded from it.—VII. On the Distinction between a true and a legal Church.—VIII. On the Church of England as modelled on the primitive Church; and as both legal and true.—IX. On Schism . Page 1—51
-

CHAPTER IX.

THE REIGN OF JAMES I.

- I. James I. on his Accession, promises to support the Hierarchy.—II. The Millenary Petition: other Petitions.—III. Hampton Court Conference.—IV. Remarks on the Proceedings.—V. Death and Character of Whitgift: Bancroft Archbishop.—VI. First Parliament: Sentiments of King and Puritans relative to the Catholics.—VII. Convocation: Canons.—VIII. Conformity enforced.—IX. Gunpowder Plot.—X. Reflections on James's Conduct towards the Papists and Puritans.—XI. Oath of Allegiance.—XII. Complaints respecting the High Commission Court.—XIII. Death and Character of Bancroft: Abbot Archbishop.—XIV. Book of Sports.—XV. Synod of Dort.—XVI. State

of Parties: Calvinists and Arminians.—XVII. Papists and Regulations for Preaching.—XVIII. Death and Character of James.—XIX. Miscellaneous Matters: Character of the Reign: Conduct of Abbot: Convocations: Amusements of the Clergy: Form of consecrating a Church: Selden's History of Tithes.—XX. Acts of Parliament.—XXI. Learned Divines

Page 52—116

APPENDIX TO THE REIGN OF JAMES I.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE SEVERAL ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS AND EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE.

Page 117—126

CHAPTER X.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES I. TO THE BREAKING OUT OF THE CIVIL WAR.

I. Wisdom of the early Reformers: Observations on Sects.—II. State of Parties: Arminians and Calvinists.—III. Proceedings against Montague, for his Arminian Book.—IV. Encroachments of the Commons.—V. The Doctrine of passive Obedience.—VI. Policy of the King's Arminian Predilections: Advancement of Laud.—VII. Fund for the Establishment of Lectureships.—VIII. Temper of the Commons.—IX. Laud enforces Ceremonies.—X. Removal of Communion-tables; and bowing to them.—XI. Puritan Preachers in Oxford.—XII. Death of Abbot: Laud Primate.—XIII. Laud promotes Juxon, and opposes the Puritans.—XIV. Prynne's *Histrio-Mastix*.—XV. The Libels of Burton and Bastwicke.—XVI. Irish, Dutch, and Scotch Churches.—XVII. Church-ales.—XVIII. The Book of Sports.—XIX. New Grounds of Offence: Bishops' Courts.—XX. Prosecution of Bishop Williams.—XXI. Attempts of Puritans to leave the Kingdom.—XXII. Laud opposes Popery.—XXIII. Bishop Hall's Treatise on Episcopacy.—XXIV. Canons passed in Convocation.—XXV. The Long Parliament condemns the Canons.—XXVI.

Laud impeached.—XXVII. Violence of the Commons, and Progress of Fanaticism.—XXVIII. Root and Branch Petition, &c. and Bill to deprive Bishops of Votes in the House of Lords.—XXIX. Committee of Scandalous Ministers.—XXX. Unjust Charge of Popery levelled at the King.—XXXI. Star Chamber and High Commission Court abolished.—XXXII. Thirteen Bishops impeached on account of the Canons.—XXXIII. The Bishops are assaulted: their Protest: they are deprived of their Votes.—XXXIV. Question—Did the Bishops presume themselves to be a third Estate?—XXXV. The Scots are engaged for the Parliament.—XXXVI. Characters of the opposed Armies.—XXXVII. Their Attendants the Preachers.—XXXVIII. State of the Metropolis.

Page 127—185

CHAPTER XI,

FROM THE BREAKING OUT OF THE CIVIL WAR TO THE
MARTYRDOM OF CHARLES.

I. Origin of the War.—II. Assembly of Divines.—III. Attempt to alter the Thirty-nine Articles.—IV. The Covenant taken by the Parliament and Assembly.—V. Persecution of malignant Ministers who refused Subscription.—VI. Ordinance for defacing the Beauty of Churches.—VII. Abolition of the Hierarchy: Religious Parties: State of Religion.—VIII. The Directory for Public Worship, and Assembly's Catechisms.—IX. The Trial of Laud.—X. His Execution and Character.—XI. Treaty of Uxbridge.—XII. Rise of the Independents in the Army: Fanatical Lay Preachers.—XIII. Debates among the religious Parties; and Settlement of the Presbyterian Discipline.—XIV. The King surrenders himself to the Scots: Conduct of the Parliament.—XV. Charles's Controversy with Henderson relative to the apostolical Institution of Episcopacy.—XVI. Proposals from the Parliament.—XVII. The Scots sell the King to the Parliament.—XVIII. Seizure of the King by the Army.—XIX. His Removal to Carisbrook Castle.—XX. Vote for no

further Addresses to the King.—XXI. The Scots invade England.—XXII. Treaty of the Isle of Wight.—XXIII. Trial and Martyrdom of Charles.—XXIV.—His Character.—XXV. Miscellaneous Matters: Opinions on the Civil War—Conduct of Universities.—XXVI. Catholics.—XXVII. Acts of Parliament.—XXVIII. Learned Divines.—XXIX. Presbyterians.—XXX. Independents. Page 186—303

APPENDIX TO THE REIGN OF CHARLES I.
ON THE QUINQUARTICULAR CONTROVERSY.

I. Calvinists: Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian; high and moderate.—II. Arminians.—III. The Five Points examined: the first, absolute Predestination; the second, partial Redemption; the third, the total Depravation of Man; the fourth, the special Call of the Elect; the fifth, the Perseverance of the Saints.—IV. Were the early English Reformers, Calvinists?—V. Are the Articles Calvinistic?—VI. Is the Liturgy?—VII. Are the Homilies?—VIII. Were the Formularies deemed Calvinistic at and after their Appearance?—IX. Comparison of the Formularies with those of other Churches, avowedly Calvinistic.

Page 304—409

CHAPTER XII.

THE COMMONWEALTH.

I. The Engagement.—II. Commissioners to examine Candidates for the Ministry: Penal Statutes abolished.—III. Acts against Licentiousness.—IV. Conciliatory Measures of the Government towards the Presbyterians and ejected Clergy.—V. Restrictions on the Press and Pulpit.—VI. Barebones' Parliament: Cromwell Protector.—VII. Enlarged Toleration.—VIII. Independents favoured: Tryers of Candidates for Orders.—IX. Lay Commissioners.—X. Encouragement of Episcopalians.—XI. Amicable Associations

among the different religious Parties: and Plan of Toleration.—XII. The Parliament seem friendly to Republicanism.—XIII. Death and Character of Crowell.—XIV. Acts or Ordinances.—XV. Learned Divines.—XVI. Miscellaneous Matters: Roman Catholics: Baptists: Independents; their Confession: Presbyterians: Death of Love.—XVII. Levellers.—XVIII. Fifth Monarchy Men.—XIX. Millenarians.—XX. Joanna Southcott: Carpenter.—XXI. Antinomians: History and Refutation of Antinomianism: Crisp, Saltmarsh, Cudworth, and Kelly.—XXII. Huntingtonians.—XXIII. Muggletonians.—XXIV.—Quakers.—XXV. Statement and Refutation of their Tenets.—XXVI. Quaker-Methodists. Page 410—550

among the different religious Parties; and Plan of To-	
retion.—XII. The Parliament, and its friendly to Ro-	
publicans.—XIII. Death and Character of Cromwell.	
—XIV. Acts of Ordinances.—XV. Learned Divines.	
—XVI. Miscellaneous Matters: Roman Catholics;	
Protestants; Independents; their Confession; Presby-	
terians; Death of Love.—XVII. Levellers.—XVIII.	
Fifth Monarchy Men.—XIX. Millenarians.—XX.	
Johns Sonnet: Carpenter.—XXI. Antinomians;	
History and Retention of Antinomianism: Gress,	
Salmagundi, Cudworth, and Kelly.—XXII. Hunting-	
tonians.—XXIII. Muggletonians.—XXIV.—Qua-	
kers.—XXV. Statement and Retention of their Tenets.	
—XXVI. Quaker-Methodists.	Page 410—550

ON THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH
OF THE
ENGLISH CHURCH AND SECTS.

INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION.
ON THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, AND THE CHURCH
OF ENGLAND AS MODELLED ON IT.

Contents.

- I. *On the various Meanings of the Word Church: Error of the Independents.*—II. *What is the Catholic Church? The visible and invisible Church.*—III. *The Requisites of the visible Church.*—IV. *On the primitive Church: and on episcopal as right and lawful Ordination.*—V. *On the Succession and Perpetuity of the Christian Ministry.*—VI. *On a true Church: and who are excluded from it.*—VII. *On the Distinction between a true and a legal Church.*—VIII. *On the Church of England as modelled on the primitive Church; and as both legal and true.*—IX. *On Schism.*

I. **HOLDING** the intermediate place betwixt the Church of Rome, a corrupted church, and that disjointed, dismembered, and disunited mass of sects, which possesses not the distinctive properties of a true church, the Reformed Church of

England professes to trace and limit the extent, to which it is right to depart from the one, and wrong to approach the other. It is as a pilot steering betwixt Scylla and Charybdis: and it counsels every navigator; "Behold the way of truth; on the right hand and on the left there is danger."

Of the Independents, Scotch Presbyterians, Whitfield Dissenters, and several other denominations of Christians, the leading principle consists in an objection to that form of church-government which is maintained, because conceived to be apostolical, or expedient, by the Church of England; combined with Calvinism in its different proportions. So far, therefore, as the dissent of these various bodies proceeds from their dislike to our established forms of subordination, the dissertation which follows, as a general reply, will prove serviceable in abridging our labour. In answer to their Calvinism, we shall refer them in a summary way to our examination of the principles held by the Calvinistic dissenters; so that the leading points of their separation being, in that manner, disposed of, the task of contending with any minor peculiarities in their respective tenets, will be reduced within a narrow compass.

To the word, "Church," various significations have, in Scripture, as well as in common discourse, been attached. In its more confined sense it denotes, either the faithful of one family, as-

sembled for religious purposes, with their friends ; as we read of the church in the house of Nymphas, of Aquila, of Philemon (Coloss. iv. 15. Rom. xvi. 5. Philem. 2) ; or the faithful of a whole province ; as Paul writes to the church of the Thessalonians (2 Thessal. i. 1), as our Articles mention the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Rome ; or as our customary phraseology speaks of the Church of England.

But the term Church frequently occurs, also, in the sacred volume, under a far more extended acceptation: "On this rock I will build my church" (Matt. xvi. 18) ; "God added daily to the church such as should be saved" (Acts, ii. 47) ; "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it" (Ephes. v. 5) ; "And he, Christ, is the head of the body, the church" (Coloss. i. 18). In these, and in many other portions of Scripture, the term Church is manifestly taken generally. It is employed as designating A BODY, concerning which, the attributes of unity and indissolubility may be predicated ; and, consequently, whenever the phrase presents itself in either of the more contracted senses above mentioned, it will be admitted, perhaps, on all hands, to be then strictly synonymous with, "*that portion of the general church, which is in the house of Nymphas, or in Jerusalem, or in England* *."

* See also 1 Corinth. xii. 13—27 ; Ephes. v. 23, 29, 30, and i. 22 ; Ephes. iv. 4, 5.

In noticing these distinctions, then, we seem, even in the outset, to have detected a leading error of the Independents; who, while they affirm that every congregation constitutes a distinct church by itself, lose sight of the latter and more comprehensive meaning attached to the term Church, in Scripture, in the writings of the Fathers, and in ordinary discourse. Neither can it be pretended that the thousand independent churches are fragments capable of being joined together, along with other societies, and formed into a whole, to be pronounced the church of Christ. “The Christian church appears to be no confused multitude of men, INDEPENDENT one on another, but a well-formed and regular society. This is evident from its names; a family, Ephes. iii. 14; a city, Heb. xii. 22; a kingdom, Matt. xvi. 18, 19.” Steevens’s Treatise; Potter, ch. i.; Daubeney, p. 36*.

* As no community can subsist without confusion, unless it be subject to some species of government, the question arises, what mode of government is proper for the ecclesiastical community in any country? This question has been answered in the following manner by Mr. Gisburne. “Each separate congregation, says the Independent, is a sovereign church, amenable to no extrinsic jurisdiction, and entitled to no authority over other churches. This, replies the Presbyterian, destroys unity, co-operation, and concord. All congregations within the same state, that agree in doctrine, ought to be under the general superintendence of a representative assembly, composed of their ministers and delegates. The episcopalian

II. But let us proceed to ask, for this is the main question, What are we precisely to under-

complaints, like the friend of monarchy, against democracy, that such a form of government wants vigour and dispatch; and is liable to partiality, tumult, and faction. He maintains that government by bishops was the apostolic form; and the form, perhaps, enjoined on the whole of Christ's disciples. Let a country be divided into dioceses, and a bishop be stationed in each, armed with sufficient authority, and restrained by adequate laws from abusing it. Away, cries the Papist, with those treasonable distinctions. The Pope, the successor of St. Peter, is, by divine right, the only source of ecclesiastical power, the universal monarch of the universal church.

“The fact,” continues our author, “appears to be, that our Saviour did not pronounce upon the subject; that the Apostles uniformly established a bishop in every district, as soon as the church in that district became numerous; and thus clearly evinced their judgment as to the form of ecclesiastical government most advantageous, at least in those days, to Christianity: but that they left no command which rendered episcopacy universally indispensable in future times, if other forms should evidently promise, through local opinions and circumstances, greater benefit to religion. Yet if the episcopal form of government was established in the apostolical age; if, in consequence of being thus established, it remained, during many centuries, the only form of government recognised in the Christian church; assuredly it advances such pretensions, we will not say of indefeasible right, but of pre-eminent claim, as to leave a most serious responsibility resting on all, who, without urgent necessity, substitute any other form in its place.”

Such are the sentiments of Hoadly, Wake, and Tomline; and nearly those likewise of Hey and Hammond*. But Mr.

* These think that there were two forms of original church-government, adapted to the churches of Asia and Europe.

stand in speaking concerning the general or Catholic church? What is its definition? What are its properties? Whom does it comprise?

Gisburne is saying too much when he affirms them to be the **GENERAL** sentiments of the present episcopal church. Has Hooker, has Potter, lost all credit amongst us? Do Burgess, Daubeney, Nares, Mesurier, Skinner (names every way worthy of being placed beside the others), hold indeed so lax a profession?

In fact, Mr. Gisburne is chargeable, in this flourishing passage, with three very material defects. First, excepting the sentence which regards the church of Rome, the paragraph represents the several parties as at variance on the sole ground of expediency; whereas some Presbyterians, and many advocates for episcopacy, maintain the divine right of their respective forms. Secondly, in speaking in the name of the Episcopalians, he has introduced a perhaps, where it clearly ought not to stand. Few Episcopalians, prior to the time of Hoadly, made use of this wavering "perhaps." Episcopacy was, till then, conceived, by most of its professors, to have been enjoined absolutely on all Christian disciples. Lastly, Mr. Gisburne has altogether neglected to define the term "Church" in the outset: and has thus betrayed himself into the egregious error of recognising the pretended church of the Presbyterians, and the ten thousand distinct churches of the Independents.

The paragraph is, nevertheless, deserving of our notice, as presenting in one concise view the various contending opinions respecting the point at issue: but it will be necessary, before we can form a correct judgment on that point, to advert to several matters omitted by Mr. Gisburne.

Vestibulo in ipso, various prejudices are to be surmounted. Such an extension of the church, as shall, in one wide sweep, comprehend the whole body of professing Christians, bears, manifestly, a seductive appearance of liberality: while what-

To these inquiries one clear answer suggests itself, from which, it is presumed, no voice will

ever contracts its definition and dimensions, savours not less of bigotry and intolerance. And this difficulty increases, when we ponder on the *consequences* of limiting the visible church within the bounds of episcopacy; of contracting the hemisphere to a cynosure. We derive this vital spark, this essence of unity, this bond of communion, from the church of Rome, a corrupted origin. And it is evident from our acknowledging as valid the orders of its apostate clergy, that we have a still stronger affinity towards that church, a church which we accuse of *sacrilege*, in stealing from the people the half of one sacrament; of *idolatry*, in the worship of saints and images; and of *blasphemy*, in praying to the mother of God; than to other bodies of professing Christians, who hold a doctrine nearly as pure as our own: thus making the form, rather than the faith, the constituent and vital principle of a church. This opinion supposes a charm, a secret virtue, by which, to state an extreme case, a vicious minister of the church of England can confer something necessary to salvation, as a sacrament is; while the same office, performed by a pious sectarist, who has in his heart devoted himself to God, is an absolute nullity. Further, it is so natural for good men, in charity, to distrust their own principles, that even they who believe the sacraments null when performed unepiscopally, are averse from all rebaptization. It is likewise natural to revolt at the idea of excluding whole congregations, nay whole nations of Christian believers, from the pale of the visible church; and this for an error in opinion—a defect in judgment. “*Ab-sit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi (i. e. episcopatus) defectum, aliquas earum à communione nostrâ abscindendas credam; aut eas nulla vere ac valida sacramenta habere, adeoque vix Christianos esse pronuntiem*.*”

* Wake's Letter to Le Clerc.

dissent. The church of Christ consists of all the elect people of God, or of all those who shall be

To these objections several replies may be made. 1st, With regard to the doctrine of exclusion, both Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, holding their respective churches to be the visible church, stand on the same grounds with the most rigid Episcopalians. 2dly, Truth is sacred and immutable; and must be received, whatever inconveniences attend its reception. 3dly, In regard to episcopacy, as being derived from Rome: what is pure is in this case extracted from what is corrupted, having remained uncontaminated in the midst of these corruptions; and is not as a shoot generated by a vitiated parent stock. 4th, As to the administration of the sacrament by vicious hands, we answer, that the treasure is contained in earthen vessels; while our 26th Article affirms that the unworthiness of ministers hinders not the effect of the sacraments. 5thly, The unwillingness to rebaptize is not universal; we would rebaptize if the former baptism had been administered by a midwife; or if it were the inward baptism of a Quaker: and as to the admission of our fallibility in other cases, that is a charity which even the church of Rome partakes with us †. 6thly, To revert to the issuing of our church from a corrupted channel: Did not Christianity issue from the Jewish church, which was corrupted, and yet the church of God? 7thly, Nor ought we to be startled in asserting the exclusive power of some to do what others cannot do; since, among the Jews, the power of the ministry was confined to a single tribe; and any who interfered with their sacred functions were put to death.

† See Hooker, b. iii. ch. 1; and Daubeney's Guide, p. 61.

It is remarkable, indeed, that both in the time of Edward VI. &c. and at present, the practical consequences have rendered men afraid of acting up fully to their conviction. Even in the beginning of the Reformation children were not rebaptized; though logically it might seem to follow from the principle contended for, that they had not been baptized at all. James, at Hampton Court, said he was averse from all rebaptization.

saved, of what nation soever ; nay, I will be bold to add, of what creed soever, from the commencement to the end of the world *. If, therefore, we possessed any means of ascertaining what persons composed this blessed company of the elect, the argument would here be at an end. But since man cannot keep pace with the prescience of the Creator, and is incompetent, is forbidden, to judge the hearts of his brethren—we must lay aside this distinction for the present life, under the title of Christ's INVISIBLE church † ; and in making mention of the general, or Catholic church, must estimate and describe it so far only as our limited understandings are able to reach ; that is, by the criterion of perceptible signs and properties. Thus our 19th Article terms the church, the VISIBLE church. We can determine, generally, under the guidance of Scripture, what is strictly essential to the church ; we can point out certain qualifications that are indispensable towards constituting any body of professing Christians, members of the visible Catholic church of Christ.

* Some writers draw a distinction between the Catholic church, and the church universal ; holding the latter to comprehend all societies of professed Christians whatever. This Barwick justly terms an improper sense of the word, p. 150.—Hickes's Letters, i. 96.—Hawerden's Charity and Truth, p. 19, 1809.

† See Hooker, b. iii. ch. 1.—Wicked men may belong to the visible church, who may be excluded from the church mystical ; and a line is also to be drawn betwixt the visible pure and the visible corrupt.

III. Agreeably to this view, the requisites of the visible church, or of any particular portion of its members, are, 1st, A congregation of faithful men *, or of men holding salvation to be alone by faith in Christ, and worshipping agreeably to that belief; and, 2dly, Pure preaching of the word of God, together with right administration of the sacraments, both performed according to Christ's ordinance, that is, as he directed; as well as by men rightly ordained, or lawfully called and sent. Thus the bond of union † in the Catholic church of Christ, is agreement in the essentials of faith, worship, and discipline.

In support of the first requisite, it may suffice to cite that passage which affirms (Acts, iv. 12), that there is salvation in none other name under heaven, save that of Jesus Christ alone. By this requisite, let it be remarked by the way, the Socinians, who disbelieve the merits of Christ's propitiatory and vicarial sacrifice, are necessarily excluded from the visible church,

The second requisite of Christ's visible church involves the question, What is a lawful call? or,

* Congregation and church were synonymous, when the Articles were drawn up.—Brett, Divine Right of Episcopacy.

† See 19th Article.—Scott's Christian Life.—Sherlock's Defence of Stillingfleet, p. 137.—Bingham's Antiq. book 6. chap. iii. and xvi. chap. xvii.—Sherlock against Fairfax, tit. iii. 44.—Field of the Church, p. 31, 80.—Kettlewell's Works, i. 679.—Sherlock's Discourse on the Notes of the Catholic Church.—Preservative against Popery, 3 vols. folio.

What is right ordination? The reply to be contended for, is, Episcopal ordination solely*: and if we can make good this point, we exclude from the visible church all denominations of Christians whose ministers are not episcopally ordained. We are justified in pronouncing them sects, and in accusing them of schism; for in their congregations, neither is the word preached, nor are the sacraments administered, according to Christ's ordinance, or by men lawfully called and sent.

Let it be observed, however, that in excluding from the pale of the visible church, the conscientious dissenter upon principle; principle, established on the basis of impartial investigation, unfeigned humility, patient study, and the best exercise of a cool and sound judgment; we would by no means be understood as pronouncing against him an anathema; as debarring him, in opinion, from the inheritance of salvation. We presume to deal around us no such bolts. We charitably hope, we believe and pray, that the schism of such an individual may be numbered with his errors of judgment, or blotted out amongst his trespasses of infirmity. Yet, guided as we are by Scripture, we cannot, while on earth, conscientiously unite with him in communion: because we possess no authority for compromising our belief

* See Brett's Church Government, and Divine Right of Episcopacy.—Potter on Church Government.—Skinner's Primitive Order.—Blondell's Apologia.—Drury's Answer to Boyse.

in the indispensableness of episcopacy to ordination; and of right ordination to the visible church *.

* We go further:—We esteem it our duty to offer a warning to those latitudinarians in principle, according to whom the visible church is composed of an heterogeneous mass of believers in Christ, whose discrepancy, as to the right preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments, is a matter of utter insignificance: nor less to all thoughtless, rambling worshippers, who, from no solid motives of conviction, no imperious call of conscience, but through caprice, idle vanity, itching ears, self-conceit, or trivial objections to minor ordinances, depart from the communion of our establishment: to both these classes we would address a solemn and solicitous caution, against rashly and wilfully incurring the guilt of schism, and the punishment, whatever it may be, attached to a wanton disturbance of the Catholic church, while holding the faith in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace. Nor let them think lightly of such an error in principle or in conduct. It has been usual to define heresy to be a separation from the church in point of doctrine; and schism, a separation owing to disagreement in external things. Thus external things being accounted non-essentials, it has been artfully inferred, that the schism which rests upon them, must needs be trifling and immaterial. Now, first, whether schism and heresy be identical, or whether schism be something less heinous than heresy; to affirm schism to be a trifling matter, is hasty and daring in the extreme. The argument may, in the outset, be turned against the proposers of it; for if external things be indeed non-essentials, so much the more reprehensible is he, who wantonly, on account of non-essentials, divides the unity of the Catholic church. And this retorted argument is the more deserving of being insisted on, since, in the only passage wherein the word Schism occurs in the Sacred Oracles (1 Cor. xii. 25), it is compared to the violent divellication of an eye, an ear, a hand, or a foot, from

IV. *On the Origin and Constitution of the primitive Church : and on episcopal, as right and lawful, Ordination.*

the human body. When, therefore, it is pleaded that schism is a separation only respecting externals, let us recollect that even such a schism is in this passage deprecated ; and that although the very lowest sense of the word Schism be received, the rash amputator incurs an awful responsibility. Charity is, to say the least, very materially endangered by each deviation, however slight, from uniformity : and since St. Paul has declared the greatest principle to be charity, that man must surely be deemed no light offender, who, with inconsiderate levity, disturbs a branch of religion, which is superior to faith and hope *. But what if this definition of schism be incorrect and imperfect ? what if there be no scriptural foundation for the distinction pretended betwixt externals and essentials ; betwixt schism and heresy ? what if heresy be the *principle* of separation, and schism the state or condition of being separated † ? The situation of the schismatic will appear, in this view, to be infinitely more alarming than before ; for it will be recollected that St. Paul, in enumerating the works of the flesh, conjoins heresies with adultery, idolatry, and mur-

* “ The unity of the Christian church will as certainly lead to a Catholic spirit of goodwill and universal fellowship, as the division of it leads to the opposite disposition.”—Daubeny’s Guide, p. 335. “ An external, visible unity of the church, promotes internal unity, and the edification of the body of Christ.”—Nicholson’s Letters, 1810, p. 20.

† There appear to have been divisions in the primitive church, among some who did not desert her communion, but contended for the preference of Paul or Apollos. Even these divisions were styled by St. Paul, the signs of a carnal mind (1 Cor. iii. 3, 4). But there were schisms moreover *from* the church ; as of those who crept into houses, and gathered private churches. Of these St. John speaks (1 John, ii. 18, 19), pronouncing them antichrists, and affirming that they went out from them. St. Chrysostom, on Ephes. iv. p. 362, observes, that nothing can provoke God more than to divide his church, &c.

To the question, what is right and lawful ordination, all denominations of Christians agree in

ders; and that some heresies are pronounced by St. Peter to be damnable, or worthy of condemnation. (Gal. v. 20; and 2 Peter, ii. 1.)

Potter on Church Gov.—Hooker's Eccles. Pol.—Daubeny's Vindic.—Steevens's Essay on the Church.—Daubeny's Guide.—Skinner's Primitive Truth.—Mesurier's Bampton Lectures.—Burgess's First Lessons, and First Principles.—Mant's Sermons.—Barwick on the Church; and Nares's Charge, 1813.—St. John.—Welshman.—Why are You a Churchman?—Whitby's Preface to Titus.

From the foregoing definition of schism we may infer the error of those, who extend the basis of the visible Catholic church of Christ, by supposing it to comprehend Christians of all denominations, assembled under, no matter what teacher, or what authority. Schism supposes a body; for it signifies an amputated limb: but if all were the body, there could be no severed member, no schism. Such a notion carries with it a fair show of liberality: but since the Bible makes mention of both schism and heresy, the burthen lies upon the latitudinarians in principle, to show, if all denominations constitute a church, who are the heretics and schismatics? or, if they cannot, let them forbear, in modesty, to launch forth the charge of illiberality, on those who confine the definition of the body, the visible church, to the aggregate of assemblies in which the word is preached and the sacraments are distributed, by ministers lawfully, that is, as we are about to show, episcopally ordained †.

† When the church is termed, metaphorically, the ark, we allude to the ark of the covenant, rather than the ark of Noah. It was for touching the former that Uzzah was struck dead: and Korah, Dathan, and Abiram are analogous to schismatics. The ark of Noah resembles that menagerie of Christian professors, which spurious liberality denominates the church: but here there can be no schism.

replying, That which is conformable to the constitution of the primitive church. If, therefore, that constitution can be shown to be episcopal, the exclusive lawfulness of episcopal ordination will be demonstrated.

We read in St. Matthew's Gospel, xvi. 18, that the Christian church was founded by our Saviour, and built on the rock of his declared divinity; or, more properly, on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" (Ephes. ii. 20). That Christ ordained the Apostles to preach and baptize, which is only a different method of stating that the church was built on the foundation of the Apostles, we learn from those passages wherein their commission is recorded.

When a fact is certain, disputes about a name are idle; and therefore, if the three orders and offices of bishops, priests, and deacons, as of persons appointed by the Apostles to govern the church, and to administer its ordinances, were distinct in the days of the Apostles, to object that their several titles were not distinct, seems a trifling and contemptible cavil *.

Now bishops, who were denominated apostles by St. Paul, received from St. John the name of angels; a word signifying messengers. In the book of Revelations (ii. 20, and ii. 14), the angels

* See Whitby on 1 Tim. iii. 1; and Pref. to Titus.

of some Asiatic churches are rebuked for a violation of their episcopal power ; and (Rev. ii. 2), the bishop of Ephesus is commended. This angel of Ephesus could not be a single presbyter, for St. Paul had sent for several presbyters from Ephesus, to meet him in his visitation at Miletus ; whereas this individual is termed THE Angel. If this were well understood and weighed, the argument would be greatly simplified. Let the question relate to the OFFICES, not to the NAMES. The real fact is, that the Apostles were the first bishops ; and that in the New Testament the names of bishop and presbyter are sometimes promiscuously employed to denote the second order of the ministry. On the frequent transposableness of these two names in the New Testament, rest the arguments and the mistakes of many dissenters. The government of the church passed, when the Apostles died, into the hands of their immediate successors ; and then, that is, after the first century, the NAMES were appropriated as they now stand ; for the bishops were no longer Apostles, or men immediately sent forth by Christ *. No change, however, took place in the offices ; these continued precisely the same as at the beginning. A governor is of the first order, whether he is called an angel, an apostle, or a bishop. A

* This explanation accords with the statement of Ambrose. *Vid.* Salmas. de Primatu, 40.

priest is of the second order, whether he is termed a bishop or a presbyter.

Some stress might here be laid on the structure of the ancient Jewish church, which had three distinct orders, High Priest, Priests, and Levites †. Agreeably to this analogy, our Lord, we are informed, named twelve Apostles, and other seventy also (Luke, vi. 13, and x. 1); so that in the earliest infancy, in the cradle of the church, three distinct orders existed: 1st, Christ himself; the great Shepherd and BISHOP of souls; the High Priest, called of God: 2dly, the Apostles: and, 3dly, the Seventy. The two last orders were mentioned by different names, and sent forth at different times. Of the Twelve, our Saviour manifested a particular care; a plain proof of their being superior to the Seventy ‡. Moreover, it was from the college of the Seventy, that the successors of the Apostles were elected; and we ask,

† See Daubeney's Guide, p. 25 and 32.—“The Jewish and Christian churches, are different editions of the same church.”

‡ The Twelve were to be “WITH our Lord” (Mark, iii. 14). The Seventy only to go before him (Luke, x. 1). The inauguration of the Twelve was more solemn than that of the Seventy: even after whose commission they were still called the Twelve. The Twelve were called Apostles; the Seventy only Disciples. The Twelve were appointed to judge the twelve tribes (Matt. xix. 28; Luke, xxii. 30; Rev. xxi. 14): Barnabas, Mark, Luke, and the seven deacons, were believed by the primitive fathers to be of the Seventy. See Potter, p. 49.

Why should Matthias have been called to fill the vacancy of Judas, if he possessed the same dignity and power as one of the Seventy, which subsequently belonged to him when chosen among the Twelve?

During the lifetime of Christ, the Apostles possessed no power of commissioning others to exercise the ministerial functions. They were only directed to pray the Lord of the Harvest, that HE would send forth labourers into his harvest. Christ, at that period, exercised the episcopal functions, exclusively, in his own person (Matt. ix. 37, 38); and he gave the foregoing direction to the Apostles and the Seventy, on the occasion of his sending them forth. Thus, if they found the harvest plenteous, and the labourers few, as they should and did find, they had no power to ordain other labourers as assistants. **THIS THEN IS THE PRINCIPLE OF EPISCOPACY.** He who is simply ordained to the ministry, has not received, by virtue of that ordination, the power of ordaining others. Indeed, the first mission of the Apostles and Seventy, was confined to the Jews (Matt. x. 5); and as our Lord was a prophet, like unto Moses (Deut. xviii. 15), his object was to adhere to the institution of Moses, who, together with twelve princes, heads of the tribes, had seventy-elders under him*.

* Numb. i. 4, and xi. 16, compared with Deut. xviii. 15, and Acts, vii. 37.

The power of governing the church was delegated to the Apostles, by Christ, a short time previous to his ascension into heaven. "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you; and he breathed on them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (John, xx. 21). A little while after, namely, on the day of Pentecost, they received it in a visible manner: and it was not till then that they began to ordain. But they then ordained both presbyters and deacons; presbyters in every city (Acts, xiv. 23); at that time called bishops, or overseers (Acts, xx. 28); and deacons to take care of the poor and widows (Acts, vi.). But the deacons (and let the Presbyterian answer this) were ecclesiastics; for they were ordained; and ordained to preach and baptize (Acts, viii. 5)*. To confirm or ordain, however, was not within their province; for Philip, one of the deacons, baptized the Samaritan converts: but Peter and John were sent down to perform those things which lay beyond the limits of diaconal authority. Here, then, immediately after the resurrection, we perceive the three orders, as well as there had been before†.

* Stephen wrought miracles, and held a dispute with the Jews (Acts, vi. 7). The word *Διακονος* is applied to St. Paul in Colos. i. 23—25; and to Paul and Apollos, 1 Cor. iii. 5.

† At first the Apostles were in common, and with equal authority, bishops of the Catholic church. But by agreement among themselves (not by any command of St. Peter), the labour was soon divided (Gal. ii. 9); James, Peter, and John being appointed to the care of the Jewish proselytes, while the

In the third chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to Timothy, the qualifications of bishops and deacons are enumerated ; no mention being made of a third order. Concerning the import of the word Bishop, in this passage, three several opinions are found amongst ancient writers, all differing from the Presbyterian interpretation*. Ac-

Gentile converts were assigned to Paul and Barnabas. The next step was to apportion a district to each Apostle ; and at this time James was settled in the bishopric of Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18, 19 ; and Jerome on Gal. i. ; Gal. ii. 1). Here he spoke with high authority in the synod : hence he sent certain to Antioch ; and hence too he directed his epistle to the twelve tribes scattered abroad. " On this account all the writers of the first ages," says Blondell (Apolog. p. 50), " unanimously style him, Bishop of Jerusalem." Some indeed have confined the church of Jerusalem to a single congregation : but since many thousands were there converted and assembled, they must have worshipped God in various congregations, though still forming but one church. They are called *μυριαδες* (Acts, xxi. 20). The Scriptures speak of the churches of a province, and the church of a city ; but Maurice (in his Answer to Clarkson, 1691) has clearly shown, that in one city there were many presbyters and congregations. — See also his Treatise on the present Church, in reply to Baxter, 1682. — Sherlock's Defence of Stillingfleet, and Sleater's Answer to Sir Peter King, which induced that author to recant his errors.

* The Presbyterians have fallen into a curious mistake in applying the term Elder to the lay officer corresponding to the *Διακονος*, or minister : while the word minister (according to their notion a lay officer) is separated from its literal meaning of deacon, and employed to signify the ecclesiastic,

according to Theodoret (Comm. in Tit. iii. 1 ; and Comm. in Phil. i. 1, and ii. 25), the presbyter is here called bishop, as the Apostle descends from him to the deacon : the office, which we now term episcopal, being, in that first age, discharged by the Apostles themselves. Epiphanius thinks that the Apostles sometimes placed only bishops and deacons, or presbyters and deacons, in a newly planted church, by reason of the paucity of its members, or, in the latter case, the difficulty of finding persons worthy of exercising the episcopal functions. Chrysostom and others consider the word Presbyter as included in that of Bishop, while they admit that ordination belongs only to the latter *.

Paul was a bishop, an *ἐπισκοπος*, overseer, or superintendent ; for he had “ the care of ALL the churches.” Let the Independent recollect, that the care and inspection of Paul was not confined to one congregation †. Let the Presbyterian remember, that there must have been presbyters in each of these churches ; and that Paul was a man invested with an authority superior to these pres-

* See Whitby on 2 Tim. and Pref. to Titus.

† The dispute which arose at Antioch respecting the extent to which the Christians ought to judaize, was referred to ANOTHER church, namely, that of Jerusalem. The question was there determined ; and from Acts, xv. 31, it appears that the decision was received with joy ; nor does any passage intimate that it was not submissively acquiesced in by those who were of a contrary opinion.

byters, and taking cognizance of them. "So ordain I," says he, "in all the churches;" that is, all which he had planted (1 Cor. vii. 17, and 2 Cor. xi. 28). He sent for the presbyters of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, and there delivered to them his episcopal charge (Acts, xx. 17). Was this the act of a temporary chairman, appointed by these Ephesian presbyters, like the Moderator of the General Assembly in Scotland? At Corinth, too, where several evangelists and prophets were present, Paul being absent, excommunicates, absolves, and enacts laws (1 Cor. xiv. 29—37).

St. John, in the same manner, possessed the authority of writing to the seven churches that are in Asia (Rev. i. 4); St. Peter, to the strangers scattered through Pontus, Galatia, &c. How these facts will comport with the hypothesis of separate, independent churches, or with that of a temporary and elected moderator, I confess myself at a loss to discover.

The episcopal authority, thus exercised for some time by the Apostles, was at length, for the sake of perpetuating the Church, by them delegated to others. *Titus* was, beyond all question, a bishop, in the strictest modern sense of the word. He was more than a presbyter, exercising acts of discipline and censure over a single congregation. He was left in Crete by St. Paul, not chosen by the Cretan people, to govern the clergy of the

whole province ; to ordain elders in every city ; and to admonish and reject heretics (Tit. i. 5, and iii. 10)*. All antiquity concurs in calling him the first bishop of Crete ; τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι (Euseb. lib. iii. ch. 4). Now, if there were presbyters previously in Crete, and if they had the power of ordaining, there was no occasion for Timothy's being settled there ; and if there were none, it was not in the co-imposition of hands by a presbytery, but in an individual, that the power of ordination was vested.

Timothy, as we learn from the first Epistle addressed to him, was, in like manner, set over the house of God in Ephesus, to ordain elders, to consecrate deacons, to charge preachers, to judge and censure offenders ; and not to suffer others to despise his authority†. This authority was not derived by Timothy from any vote of the people, but from the imposition of St. Paul's hands (2 Tim. i. 6 ; 1 Tim. iv. 14). The ancient Fathers invariably call Timothy the bishop of Ephesus : and twenty-seven bishops are numbered as his successors, down to the council of Chalcedon‡.

Now this church of Ephesus, in all probability,

* To the Independent we would submit, that the expression, "Set in order things," i. e. spiritual things, "in every city" (Tit. i. 5), implies jurisdiction over a variety of churches ; as also does the τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν above.

† 1 Tim. i. 3, and v. 19 ; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

‡ Potter, p. 143.

comprehended more congregations than one. We deduce this inference from the circumstance above mentioned, of St. Paul's sending for the Ephesian elders to meet him at Miletus; which seems to indicate, that, in the former city, a nursery was reared for surrounding churches. At any rate, we are certain, that presbyters were there settled previous to Timothy's appointment; a superfluous appointment, if the presbyters there established had, in themselves, the power of ordaining (Acts, xx. 30, 31; 1 Cor. iv. 15, and xvi. 8, 9).

Again; St. Paul, in writing to the Philippians, joins Timothy with himself, as a person of the same order: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints that are in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons" (Phil. i. 1). Here the three orders are distinctly mentioned: Paul and Timothy, of the first; the bishops, i. e. presbyters, of the second; and deacons, of the third. In the whole New Testament, indeed, no intimation occurs of any other kind of ordination*.

From the foregoing instances, therefore, it may be concluded, against the Presbyterians, that the superiority of one pastor over others is conformable to evangelical discipline; that it is conferred by ordination, not by election or assumption; that it is an indelible order; not a temporary or permanent degree. We may conclude, against the

* See Hooker's Preface.

Independents, that an exercise of jurisdiction over more churches than one, is agreeable to the practice of the primitive church; and against both, that the apostolical power of ordaining elders, and of governing churches, might be, and was communicated: and that that same episcopal power, the power of ordaining, confirming, and governing, might be delegated by those on whom it was conferred (Tit. i. 5—7; 1 Tim. iii. 5).

V. On the Succession and Perpetuity of the Christian Ministry.

When our blessed Lord declared to his Apostles, that on them, as on a foundation, his church should be built, he added an assurance that the gates of hell should never prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18), signifying that it should last for ever. This perpetuity was farther secured, by the promise of its Founder's continual protection and presence. He will be in the midst of its congregations, gathered together in his name (Matt. xviii. 20). He is with his disciples alway, even unto the end of the world (John, x. 28): they shall never perish; a promise addressed to the Apostles, the first bishops; but signifying that he would be with their successors in the episcopal office; and thus implying a power in them to set apart successors for its discharge. In conformity with this promise, as God the Father had first delivered the authority of the Christian ministry to the Son; so by him it was communicated to his Apostles: "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you"

(John, xx. 21); and by inversion, he that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me (Matt. x. 40).

Here let it be observed, that the apostolic office was not personal and temporary. It was matter of succession, as evidently appears in the cases of Matthias and Barnabas: of Matthias, whose election, or taking of the "*bishopric*" of Judas, was declared by St. Peter to be a necessary matter (Acts, i.); of Barnabas, who had been one of the Seventy, but was separated, together with St. Paul, for the work, by prayer and imposition of hands*; who is called an Apostle†; and who performed apostolic works‡.

After the first descent from Christ, the ministerial authority was again transmitted by the Apostles, as they had received it, to those whom they intrusted with the government of the infant church; as, for example, to Timothy and Titus (1 Tim. iv. 14; explained by 2 Tim. i. 6; Tit. i. 6).

Now we further read, that Timothy, commissioned in this manner, by the imposition of St. Paul's hands, delivered the same authority, by the same laying on of hands, "to other faithful men" (2 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22). To these (Ignatius, Polycarp, Clemens Romanus, and others, all bishops), and not to the presbyters at large, were committed in succession, not diocesan jurisdic-

* Acts, xiii. 2, 3. † Acts, xiv. 14. ‡ Acts, xiv. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 4—6; 2 Cor. viii. 25; Phil. ii. 25.

tion ; not hereditary presidency ; but plenitude of ecclesiastical authority, and power of ordaining.

The succession, descending thus uninterruptedly to the third generation, would undoubtedly be preserved with care, by the fourth and fifth, and every following race of Christian pastors. How, indeed, could the perpetuity, promised by Christ to his church, be more effectually secured, how could the promise itself be more correctly verified, than by protracting the chain with its links unbroken, by perpetuating an institution expressly appointed by Christ himself, for the service, the support, and the continuance of that church ?

But this important fact will appear in a stronger light, if, instead of gliding down, we move up the stream of time. In episcopal countries, from the present day to the Reformation, the succession of bishops is preserved in indisputable record. From the year 1500, to the beginning of the fourth century, the absolute universality of episcopacy is a fact which no attempt is made to deny. How, then, stands the case from the fourth century to the first ? Express mention is made concerning the three orders, by the apostolic canons, and by various early councils* ; by St. Jerom, A. D. 378, *Ep. ad Evagrium* ; by Cyprian, A. D. 250, *Epist. 16*, and Sage's *Cyprianic Age* ; by Irenæus, A. D. 167 (*lib. iii. ch. 3, p. 200* and

* *Apost. Can. 1 ; Co. Nicen. 4 ; Co. Arel. 21 ; Co. Par. 6 ; by the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 321 ; Co. Lao. 12.*

360) ; by Clemens Romanus, mentioned by St. Paul, Phil. iv. 3 ; Epist. to Corinth. § 40, 41, and by Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who died A. D. 107, only seven years after St. John. “ Mention is made, by Irenæus and others, of the succession of bishops and their inferior presbyters in the same church *.” “ This, then, must have been conformable to still earlier, nay, to the earliest practice ; for it cannot be supposed that the whole church could have become so suddenly, so thoroughly, and so contentedly corrupted †.”

No one instance, indeed, can be produced, of any early church governed otherwise : and as there was then no authoritative prince or council, no compact or intercourse between remote churches, such as those of Persia and Spain ; as all churches must have been interested in opposing innovation, we may conclude that episcopacy was established in the apostolic age (that is, after and under Christ) by the Apostles. Hence, in the Nicene creed, the Church is styled justly the Catholic and Apostolic Church. And thus the commission to preach, to baptize, and to perform the several duties of the Christian ministry, may be traced in uninterrupted transmission, from the Apostles ‡.

* Whitby, Pref. to Titus.

† Whitby.

‡ For proofs of the distinct orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, drawn from the writings of the three first centuries, the following books may be consulted : Leslie on the Sacrament ; Scholar Armed, vol. i. 1795 ; Barwick, p. 36 ; Potter,

Now these duties it is unlawful for any man to undertake, without the sanction of this spiritual commission, and independently of this lineally inherited authority. "No man taketh to himself this honour, but he (alone holds it) that is called of God, as was Aaron †."

We learn, however, from the book of Exodus, that the call of God to Aaron was a supernatural

154, 214; Brett's Div. Right, p. 27; Bishop Taylor's Episcopacy Asserted; Brookesley's Primit. Church, 1712; Maurice against Baxter, 1682; Parker and Burrough on Church Government, 1692; Bingham's Antiq. book ii. c. 1—3; Drury's Answer to Boyse; and Skinner's Primit. Church.

† The commission of the Apostles provides against self-constituted authority. Daubeney, p. 22.

"Not even our Lord glorified himself to be an High Priest, but He that said unto him, Thou art my son (Heb. v. Matt. iii. 17). The plea of superior sanctity is inadmissible; it was the plea of Korah: unworthy ministration impairs not the efficacy of the ordinance. Neither is the plea of good intention more valid: Uzzah meant well in touching the ark, and Saul in sacrificing." See Daubeney's Fourth Discourse.

A distinction is made in Scripture between gifts and a commission: the one being a qualification for the other. 1 Tim. iii. Tit. i. Acts, vi. 3, where it is plain that no qualifications can entitle a man to discharge ecclesiastical functions without the laying on of hands. Our Lord called his Apostles, and set them apart. Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. i. 15, 16. Stephen, a man full of the Holy Ghost, did not exercise the least of ministries, till he had submitted to the imposition of hands. Hence the error of fanatics, who deem an inward call sufficient. See Drury's Second Answer, p. 64, and Third, p. 104. Daubeney, vol. iv. p. 404.

call, an immediate voice (Exod. iv. 27). And the Lord said unto Aaron, "Go into the wilderness, to meet Moses;" and if these words should be explained away, by pretending that Aaron felt a secret impulse, (the preceding conversation held with Moses from the burning bush, would remove all doubt as to the genuineness of that impulse. Certain it is, that, since the cessation of miraculous agency, an inward call, a disposition to enter the ministry, is the only mode whereby any man can now be called of God, as was Aaron. But St. John reminds us, that it is possible for persons to deceive themselves, in imagining that they have been called of God. "Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they be of God; because many false prophets (i. e. false teachers) have gone into the world" (1 John, iv. 1).

And, indeed, we are very well able to conceive that caprice, fickleness, indisposition to regular industry, a desire of holding forth, a love of consequence or authority, or various other motives, might easily be mistaken for a genuine call to the ministry. Since, therefore, self-love and self-delusion render a man an unfit judge in his own case, it becomes necessary that in some superior mind should be lodged the power of determining of that call, whether it be of God or not. This power, which is exercised by resorting to the best tests, by investigating the intellectual and moral

qualifications of the candidate, was committed by St. Paul to Timothy, the first bishop of Ephesus, when he enjoined that disciple to be cautious, WHOM he ordained to the ministry; "to lay hands suddenly on no man" (1 Tim. v. 2); to see, that these also be proved, after which they should exercise the office of a deacon, "being found blameless" (1 Tim. iii. 10*). Even Aaron himself, in whatever manner he was called, was publicly admitted to the office by Moses, whom the occurrence of the burning bush had empowered to judge concerning the credit due to that voice, by which his brother pretended to be moved †.

* This power implies all necessary authority, and is proved by the precepts enjoining submission to spiritual rulers. Daubeny, p. 18.

† As there are three orders of offices in churches, no inferior can possess the powers of his superior; and no layman can exercise the powers of any of the three. As to an inward call, it must be subjected to examination; least of it may exist where most is pretended; and any impostor, assuming his possession of it, might preach, and vilify the Gospel. That self-appointed teachers lead good lives, and preach successfully, is no vindication of their ministry: for several atheists have led virtuous lives; and a good life, coupled with erroneous doctrine, only renders the error more dangerous: as wine, says an old writer, is an antidote to arsenic; but if both be taken together, the poison works more powerfully. Much stress has been laid on the successful preaching of laymen: but the remote consequences of fomenting divisions in a body whose bond should be peace, may counterbalance all the immediate advantage derived from such specious success. As to the duty

Upon the whole, it has now been shown, first, that, in addition to an inward call, an outward ordination, by imposition of hands, is necessary to the Christian ministry: secondly, that this ordination should be preceded by a judgment, pronounced by a qualified person, not the candidate, approving of the call as genuine: thirdly, that the early church was episcopal: fourthly, that the joint powers of judging concerning a call, and of ordination to the ministry, were delivered by Christ to the Apostles, and by the Apostles to the first bishops: fifthly, that unity and perpetuity belong to the church of Christ, and that there is a perpetual succession in the Christian ministry: and sixthly, that this succession, which, for the first 1500 years after Christ, comprehended the national clergy of all Christian countries, all being episcopal, has, since that time, been continued

of comforting and edifying one another, that relates solely to private conversation: for the Scriptures, neither by precept nor example, recommend lay preaching. Lay preachers are neither ambassadors nor stewards (1 Cor. iv. 1; and 2 Cor. v. 19). Korah (Numb. xvi.), Uzzah (2 Sam. vi. 6), and Saul (1 Sam. xiii.), were all punished for vaulting into the sacerdotal office. If, then, the violation of the substance be more flagrant than that of the shadow, let not the transgressor think himself secure, because he escapes immediate judgment. The commission is to be expected from the ordainers, who judge of the qualifications, and give the power transmitted from Christ by imposition of hands. For further investigation of this subject, see Barwick and Daubeney.

uninterruptedly and exclusively in the persons of all ministers episcopally ordained *.

We conclude, that the power of judging concerning calls to the ministry, the laying on of hands, and the whole office of ordination, rests with bishops, and with bishops alone, agreeably to the pristine usage of the church, and by the right of an uninterrupted inheritance.

From this conclusion, it follows immediately and inevitably, as *one* corollary, that any person not episcopally ordained, is not ordained; as another, that ecclesiastical functions, such as public preaching and the administration of the sacrament, performed by such a person (however God may graciously extend indulgence to good intention), cannot be said to have been performed rightly, efficaciously, and according to the divine law †; so that, in an ecclesiastical sense, they must be held as altogether null: and as a third, that any congregation of professing Christians, dissenting from the principle of episcopal ordination, cannot be held as members of Christ's visible church ‡.

* This was the early method (Acts, vi. 6, and xiii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 6). It was always appropriated to an order superior to presbyters; and, after the age of the Apostles, it was looked upon as sacrilege for any mere presbyter to pretend to it.

† Οὐκ ἔστιν ἔξω χωρὶς τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς βαπτίζειν, ἢ τε ἀγαπῆν ποιεῖν.
Ignatius, Epist. ad Smyr. ch. viii.

‡ The powers of the church of Christ are of a spiritual nature: 1st, That of preaching, which is confined to those who

VI. *Of a true Church, and who are excluded from it.*

A true church, a component part of Christ's visible church, we have seen to be a congregation of faithful men, in which the word is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered, by persons rightly, episcopally ordained. By this definition, the Roman Catholic church is not embraced. Prior to its doctrinal corruptions it was, indeed, a true church ; but it can now make no pretension to such a title ; for the sacraments cannot be pro-

have a commission (Rom. x. 14, 15 ; Luke, iv. 18 ; Mark, iii. 14, and vi. 7 ; Matt. xxviii. 19 ; 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2 and 32). 2dly, That of praying in the congregation (Acts, vi. 4 ; James, v. 14 ; Rev. v. 8). 3dly, That of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19 ; Acts, ix.). 4thly, That of consecrating the Eucharist (Luke, xxii. 19) ; but deacons are not permitted to exercise this function ; because only the high priest, and priests of the second order, under the law, could offer sacrifices. 5thly, That of confirmation ; reserved, however, to bishops (Acts, viii. 14, 17, and xix. 6). 6thly, That of ordination (John, xvii. 18, and xx. 21) : exclusively reserved to the highest order (Acts, vi. 3, 16, and xiv. 23 ; Titus, i. 5, 9) : for to what purpose was Titus left in Crete, and Timothy sent to Ephesus, if presbyters, who were in both places before, had power to ordain ? 7thly, That of making canons, as to the outward peace and order of the church (1 Cor. xi. 16). 8thly, That of judging, censuring, and excommunicating offenders (Matt. xvi. 19, and xviii. 15—17 ; Acts, v. 12 ; 1 Cor. v. 1 ; 1 Tim. v. 19 ; Tit. iii. 10 ; Rev. ii. 15, 16). 9thly, That of demanding a competent maintenance from the people (Luke, viii. 2, 3 ; Matt. x. 9, 10 ; 2 Thess. iii. 1 ; 1 Cor. ix. 6). See Potter and Steevens.

nounced "duly administered" where one half of one of them is withheld from the laity. Our definition excludes likewise from the pale of the visible church, both Presbyterians and Independents, since the ministering persons in their respective congregations are not rightly, or episcopally ordained. We dare not, we cannot affirm, with confidence, that they are members of the church spoken of in Scripture, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail (Matt. xvi. 18); that church, "for which Christ gave himself, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing" (Ephes. v. 23—28); that church to which Jesus Christ adds daily such as shall be saved (Acts, ii. 47).

Pursuing an authorized highway to heaven, we cannot assure those brethren who go not along with us, that their by-paths will certainly lead them thither. Lead thither they may; sincerely do we hope they will; but we have no written sanction for speaking of them with stronger confidence. Denizens of the new Jerusalem by charter, we pretend not to determine absolutely, that no act of special favour will extend the like privilege to professors varying from us in opinion: but we have received no sealed authority from the King to grant them the freedom of the city. To employ a phrase, not the less significant or excellent because it has been derided and despised, we leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

We inquire, not with pride or severity, what shall become of others. We follow our Lord and Master in the way which we know to be safe. Let others pursue their own way. We cannot say they are right, but we bid them God speed on their journey*.

VII. *On the Distinction betwixt a true and a legal Church.*

We will next advert briefly to the distinction betwixt a true and a legal church.

A legal church is a church established by the law of the land. A church may be true, yet not legal, as episcopacy is in Scotland; or legal without being true, as is the kirk in the same country. In England episcopacy is both a true and legal church†.

* “Sincerity in any profession is not sufficient: for a Mahometan or Pagan may be sincere. Yet though we believe that there is no positive security out of the ark, we pretend not that all who are in it shall be certainly saved. Ham was delivered from the flood, yet afterwards accursed as a reprobate.”—JONES ON THE CHURCH.

† See Claggett in Answer to Manby, and Ward's Queries; Barwick, p. 97; Turner on Ecclesiast. Authority, 1717; Brett's Independ. of Church on State, 1717; Synge's Constit. of the British Church, 1728; Burgess's Catechism of Christ and his Church.

In a country like Scotland, where a church is legal though not true, the friends of episcopacy ought to rest satisfied with Christian toleration: they have no right to set aside the authority of the civil magistrate; fair persuasion they may exercise, but must avoid rebellious contention, for they are enjoined to

The general obligation of every Christian, to submit to the ordinances of man, and to be subject to the powers that be (Rom. xiii. 1), will incline him, in the first instance, as a quiet subject, towards the established or legal church in any country. Yet since "true," when designating a church, is a more important epithet, and a higher character, than "legal;" a personal, not a rebellious or subversive separation from a church which is not "true," supersedes the duty of adhering to it as "legal." Disregard of what is established, however, being in itself an evil, such a separation ought never to take place rashly. A man ought previously to possess the fullest assurance, that his mind is wholly free from any undue influence, whether of pride, passion, levity, itching ears, or other sinister motive. Thus commencing, it will be his next precaution to examine the merits of the church, of which he contemplates the desertion; and to compare them with the principles of the congregation he proposes to join; having recourse to all accessible means of forming a just conclusion; deep thought, patient investigation, the best books, and the counsel of sagacious, unbiassed friends. Let him, then, obey the decision

submit to human ordinances (1 Peter, ii. 13), and persecuted in one city, to flee to another (Matt. x. 23). The same rule ought manifestly to operate, with regard to sects of all descriptions in England, and to Roman Catholics in our sister island.

of reason and conscience ; and if he errs, although we may not for the present feel authorized to include him within the fold of Christ's visible church, we cannot, in charity, believe that he errs unpardonably. But, alas ! in departing from an established, a legal church, how very few are competent to institute such an inquiry ! how few will take the trouble to institute it ! This amounts to a most serious consideration, when, according to strong probability, the church hastily abandoned, is not only a legal, but a true church : for, in that case, not only are the laws of the land infringed, the ordinances of man violated, and the duties of subjects slighted, but the sin of schism is moreover committed ; and all that danger incurred, which follows an inconsiderate and needless disturbance of the general holding of the faith, in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace.

VIII. *On the Church of England, as modelled on the primitive Church : and as both legal and true.*

The Church of England is the church of Christ, established in England by the laws. It is thus both a legal and a true church : legal, as established ; and true, because it boasts the pure preaching of the word, and right administration of the sacraments, by persons duly ordained. The Church of England is formed after the model of the primitive church. In DOCTRINE, besides

the general features of Christianity, it professes to believe in a Trinity in unity, in the original corruption of man, in his personal disobedience and unworthiness; in redemption by Christ, in salvation through grace, in justification by faith, in faith as a principle of holiness; and in regeneration by the Spirit of God. All these points of doctrine are incorporated in its articles, homilies, and liturgy*.—In *worship*, it discards whatever is superfluous, and retains whatever is essential. It rightly administers the two sacraments. Its prayers are conducted by a liturgy: and Dr. Bennet has proved, in his *History of set Forms*, 1708, that the Jews, our Saviour, his Apostles, and the primitive Christians, never joined in any, except pre-composed prayers. But forms are not less expedient than lawful. Is it not highly proper that the several supplicants should agree with respect to the object of their petitions? Matt. 18, 19.—But how can they do so, without previous concert? Forms are expedient as the most prudent method of avoiding whatever is rash, indecent, or irreverent. And, in fact, the Lutheran and Bohemian churches, the churches of Denmark, Sweden, Geneva, Holland, France, America, England, Ireland, and the Scotch episcopal

* See Grant's Sermon on the Reasonableness of the Established Church—Beveridge's Sermons, vol. i. p. 139—Why are you a Churchman?—Daubeny's Guide—Woodward's Pre-
tence for Separation.

church, have all their several liturgies: so likewise have many dissenting congregations in England, as the Moravians, Swedenburgians, and Whitfield Methodists: and so would the ministers of the Kirk of Scotland (it is believed), were it not for the prejudices of the people*.

In the present situation of the world, then, forms possess the advantage over extemporaneous prayer. They are equally dictated by the Spirit; for why should he not influence the composer in his study, as well as the offerer of unpremeditated petitions? The case becomes stronger when we recollect that the composers of the liturgy of England, were not one but many; and that these were the wisest and most virtuous persons in the nation (most of them afterwards martyrs); each of whom might temper and correct the error of the others. A liturgy informs us, before we repair to the house of worship, what prayers are to

* See Christian Observer, 1809.

The inspired Apostles and early disciples, had, it is true, less occasion than we have for forms (although in the Lord's prayer they had one which was perfect, and which was given as a model for their future devotions), since prayer may readily be supposed to have been dictated to them, by a more enlarged measure of the Divine Spirit. But when Christianity had settled itself, this extraordinary assistance which had been imparted to strengthen it against the first opposition it encountered, being no longer necessary, was withdrawn: and Christians are now supported only with those common influences, which prompt, aid, and strengthen their own exertions and co-operations.

be offered in our name : we thus enjoy a previous opportunity of studying them ; and of either approving of their excellence, or, if we dislike them, of withdrawing from the place where they are offered.—While the minister is reading, our attention is not divided ; we have nothing to distract us from our devotion. How differently situated is a congregation listening to extemporaneous prayer ; wherein he who is their organ and mouth may shock his fellow-worshippers, while they are lifted on the wing of adoration, by vulgar expressions ; or by ignorant, unlawful, trifling supplications : and while communing with the Great Hearer of prayer in their name, make them advance opinions different from those they hold ; as well as prefer petitions foreign to their wishes or principles.—“ In meetings,” says Bennet, “ the people are no otherwise employed in time of prayer than in the sermon ; that is, to stand or sit at their ease, and hear. On the other hand, the members of the church pray in humble posture : with one heart and voice, presenting, on their knees, their petitions to God, with as much fervour and devotion as their minister.”

Whatever beauty and propriety the original composers of a liturgy have given it, continue with it on all occasions. All who join in it are sure that neither incapacity, nor indolence, nor lukewarmness, nor occasional elevation or depression of spirits ; neither political bias, nor malig-

nant passions, nor want of orthodoxy, nor excess of enthusiasm in their minister, can communicate themselves to the supplications offered in their name, and in their behalf, as may obviously be done, wherever there is no form of prayer. Now, while liturgies in general are thus preferable to extemporaneous prayers, the devotional service of the Church of England is the best of all liturgies. For sublimity, simplicity, and propriety of language;—for raising the humble, cheering the contrite, soothing the afflicted;—for furnishing expressions to sentiments of divine affection, supplication, praise, thanksgiving;—for reasonableness in its progress from exhortation to confession;—from confession to an offer of absolution to sincere penitence;—from hence to prayers for divine assistance;—mingled with praise, thanksgiving, the reading of the word of God, and professions of faith;—for providing petitions for all the exigencies of men in general; and even for the various temporal wants of individuals;—for propriety in conducting public worship by short prayers, responses, and other innocent means, which stimulate attention, and prevent devotion from growing weary: the liturgy of the established church, for all these excellencies, stands unrivalled among human compositions*.

* Johnson Grant's Sermon on the Reasonableness of the Established Church. Hatchard, 1807. A Quaker at Liverpool thought this sermon worth answering and abusing in an

The English liturgy is founded on evangelical principles; and is, in fact, the doctrines of the articles and homilies, that is, of Scripture, embodied in a devotional form. Thus, whatever the preacher may be, we are assured, that in one part of our service, the evangelical doctrines will be preserved; teaching the congregation, as well as prescribing their supplications; and bringing back their sentiments continually to a pure standard.

From considering the worship of the Church of England, let us pass on to its form of government. It is placed under episcopal authority; which we have seen to be strictly conformable to early, to apostolic practice. It acknowledges the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons. It holds deacons not to be lay officers; but an order of ecclesiastics, inferior to presbyters, as Levites were to priests; and originally appointed to divide their labour, by assisting in an ecclesiastical function; namely, in the administration of the sacraments (Acts, vi. 2, and viii. 12). Speaking moderately, we are, in our church, in no doubt respecting the valid ordination of our ministers, and administration of the sacraments.

With reference to other matters appertaining to

anonymous pamphlet. I cannot, in truth, return him the compliment: but I will advise him to set his brain in order, and to learn to reason before he ventures again to write.

discipline, the English church copies the apostolical institutions and practice, wherever they are capable of being ascertained : and as to ceremonies and forms which are left to discretionary arrangement, undirected by the letter of a law, she approximates as nearly as possible to right reason and the intention of Scripture ;—and in these non-essentials prescribes uniformity with a view to the preservation of harmony and peace ; and to the yielding of compliance with the scriptural injunction—Let all things be done in order (1 Cor. xiv. 40) *.

In fine, the English church is thus scriptural and reasonable in her doctrines, her ritual, her government. Her liturgy is sublime ; her ceremonies are simple ; her forms are edifying ; her ordinances are significant ; her festivals are decent ; her offices are strictly proper ; her general regulations are founded in wisdom. Having respect to the words and example of Christ and his Apostles, she answers every good end of Christian worship and Christian fellowship ; of sound doctrine and pure morality. When received in an honest and good heart, she is abundantly suffi-

* “ Accessary things no more change the way of salvation,” says Hooker, “ than a path is changed by the gravel, stones, or grass which cover its surface.”—“ Every church may choose its own ceremonies, lest religion should consist too much of ceremonies.”—Calvin.

cient, even in her lowest pretensions, to make her votaries wise unto salvation. It is the wisdom, it is the safety, it is the duty of every man, who cannot with the clearest proof gainsay these propositions to his own conscience, to conform to the English church; for, if it be a true church, we know that we are in a state of salvation while we dwell in godly and brotherly union with it: whereas, we are far from being certain that a state of separation is a state of safety.

IX. Of SCHISM.

Nor let any man think lightly of a wanton and unreflecting secession from the established religion of England. It is the religion patronized and preferred by the civil government of his country; and commands deference, not only on the good principle, of submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake (1 Peter, ii. 13); but more eminently, because the powers that be in it, are (as we have shown) ordained of God. Christ, the Prince of the kings of the earth, is the spiritual head of the church (Rev. i. 5; Col. ii. 10). And as kings and magistrates are in general God's ministers on earth, for the purposes of government—our wise laws have appointed our chief magistrate, the king, to be the temporal head of the Church of England: which he is sworn to defend and to uphold*.

* See Preface to the Thirty-nine Articles.

An uniformity of worship, according to the Book of Common Prayer, is, further, required by the laws; “for prevention of factions and schisms, for settling the peace of the church, and of the nation; for the honour of religion, and the propagation thereof.”—Stat. 13 & 14 Ch. II. Now, according to the 30th canon, “Things, of themselves indifferent, do in some sort alter their natures when they are either commanded or forbidden by a lawful magistrate; and may not be omitted at any man’s pleasure, contrary to the law, when they are commanded; or used, when prohibited.” Admitting, then, uniformity to be indifferent in itself, by carrying the force of a law, it becomes an obligation and a duty, which ought strictly to be observed, “not only for wrath, but also for conscience’ sake *” (Rom. xiii. 5).

To those who have been trained up in communion with the established church, a religion patronized by “the king, who is to be honoured,” and recommended by laws to which they ought to submit, will doubtless seem invested with a fresh claim to veneration when it is viewed as the religion of their parents. While others who have been educated in opposition to the established religion, are led by their duty of submission to

* “Schism,” says Sherlock, “is the setting up of teachers, independent of the government, and destructive of the unity of the Christian church.” Disc. of relig. Assemblies. See Bishop Burgess’s Catechism.

Magistrates and civil ordinances, to suspect and investigate the grounds of their dissent, and to inquire whether their parents may not have erred through ignorance; in the minds of these, more happily initiated, the obligations of loyalty and subjection will gather strength from being intertwined with the demands of filial respect. They will hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering: and the form of sound words which has been committed to them, without departing from it (Heb. x. 23; 2 Tim. i. 13).

We have, however, far more cogent reasons for conforming to the established church, than the respect due to civil institutions, and the duty of "honouring father and mother." It has claims on us as subjects, and as sons and daughters:—but we are more especially required to comply with it, as obedient Christians.

Divisions are contrary to the precepts of Christ and his Apostles; to the Christian profession, to the peace, the unity, the proper character of the church of Christ: and, lastly, they are hindrances to the Gospel (Rom. xvi. 17). If our Lord, in his human capacity, prayed to his heavenly Father, that his disciples might be one, even as he and that Father are one (John, xvii. 11), and this to the express end that the world might believe him to be the Messiah:—if St. Paul represents the church, the mystical body of Christ, under the similitude of a natural body, from which

none of the members should be dissevered (1 Cor. xii. 27 ; Ephes. v. 30 ; Galat. iii. 28 ; Ephes. iv. 4—6) ;—if the same Apostle exhorts Christians to humility, charity, and adherence to the form of sound words (2 Tim. i. 13), condemning as strenuously, heresies, strifes, divisions, vain jangling, and oppositions of false science (1 Tim. iv. 6, and vi. 4, 20, 21, &c.) ; if he derives a further argument for unity among Christians, from the unity subsisting among the doctrines and ordinances of the church (1 Cor. xii. 13, and Ephes. iv. 4, 6) ; if he beseeches the Ephesians to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Ephes. iv. 1—3) ; the Philippians to stand fast in one spirit, and with one mind (Phil. i. 27) ; and the Romans, with one mind and one mouth, to glorify God (Rom. xv. 6) : if he conjures some disciples to be like-minded, having the same love, of one accord and of one mind ; by “ the consolation of Christ, by the comfort of love,”—by all that is valuable to believers ; further, if he promises that the God of love and peace will dwell with those who live in peace and are of one mind (2 Cor. xiii. 11) :—and if mutual charity, the test of Christ’s disciples (John, xiii. 35), cannot easily be supported independently of this consolidation of minds : if these things be so, and they are only so many excerpts from the Bible, we shall not hastily and petulantly condemn those as formalists, who are ear-

nest in enforcing the duty of unity, and in exposing the danger of schism. But further: since St. Paul dissuades his brethren against dissensions and divisions, even by the solemn adjuration of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. i. 10); since he numbers heresies, seditions, variance, emulations, envyings, among the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 20); and directs that those who caused these divisions and offences, preaching Christ out of contention, subverting houses, teaching what they ought not, and understanding not what they affirm, creeping into houses, and leading captive silly women (Phil. i. 16; Tit. i. 11; 1 Tim. i. 7; 2 Tim. iii. 6), should be marked and avoided (Rom. xvi. 17; Tit. iii. 10): since another Apostle condemns those who separate themselves from the church, as sensual, having not the Spirit (Jude, 19); and since the denunciation is extended to persons of itching ears, who, not satisfied with the doctrine of their appointed ministers, heap to themselves unauthorized teachers*; and thus participate the guilt of schismatical teaching, by encouraging it; nay, since, by disunion and schism, we cause OFFENCES, or hindrances—offences contrary to the doctrine of love (Rom. xvi. 17), and hindrances to the gospel of peace (2 Cor. xiii. 11, and Ephes. vi. 15), as well as to that order which St. Paul recommended (1 Cor. xiv. 40); unity

* 2 Tim. iv. 3.

must be regarded as still more desirable and important.

There is undoubtedly a degree of strong conviction, which may supersede all these considerations. But strong it must be: a complete conviction of the understanding; after long, patient, and unbiassed investigation. The desertion of a religion consecrated by the allegiance we owe to governors and laws; a religion pure in its doctrines, apostolic in its ordinances, spiritual in its forms, simple in its ceremonies; sublime, rational, conducive to sound morals; and sufficient for eternal salvation: a religion bearing every token of its being the ark of God, the church of Christ; preserved for ages, but purified from base corruptions; more especially when this is the religion in which we have been trained: the desertion of such a system, we must needs allow, is not by any to be enterprised rashly and wantonly; to gratify itching ears, or fickle propensities, or slight objections to minor arrangements: and that man incurs a heavy responsibility, who forsakes the established church of England, without being able fully to disprove to his own mind, by satisfactory reasoning, its pretensions to all the characters of a true church, above recited. But, alas! how scanty is the number of dissidents, who are competent to investigate the merits and principles of the church abandoned! how few take the trouble of pursuing such an investigation! Even of those few, how pre-

carious is the situation! Like doves escaped from the ark, they may attempt to nestle on the waves; but may, perchance, in the end, regret that they had not abided in a habitation of greater safety*.

* Nothing less than **SINFUL** terms of communion can justify a separation: such as the idolatries of the church of Rome. Now the old dissenters, the Brownists, accused the English church as idolatrous; and the old non-conformists conformed as laymen. It was reserved for late years to deem schism justifiable on *slight grounds*. The Scotch Presbyterians, in their memorial to the House of Commons, of 1790, allow that their members may occasionally hold communion with the church of England. But it is remarked by the Presbyterian Assembly of England, in 1648 (Papers for Accommodation, p. 48), that separation from churches, visibly and ordinarily, with whom you may occasionally conform, seemeth *a most unjust separation*. The Irish Presbyterians allow, that Episcopalians belong to the true church of Christ—that presbytery is not essential, and has no divine right, &c.—Nicholson's Letters to Rogers, p. 17, 1810. That the French Protestants are of the same opinion, is manifest from Bingham's Apology of the French Church, &c.

If, then, occasional communion may be admitted, why not perpetual? or, why should the sin of schism be hazarded, if the things complained of are such non-essentials as to admit of occasional communion? Nothing, says Dr. Bennet, can justify non-conformity, except the **SIN** of conformity.

See Hooker, Collinson's Abridg. p. 195, 332.

Unity, so strongly recommended in the New Testament, can only be kept up by visible communion. Nor can the amphibious men, who divide their affections betwixt a church and conventicle, be excused from the charge of schism. Each visit to the conventicle is a schismatical act. St. Cyprian would not have permitted men, after it, to join in the church communion. See Barwick, p. 62.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REIGN OF JAMES I.

Contents.

- I. *James I. on his Accession, promises to support the Hierarchy.*—II. *The Millenary Petition: other Petitions.*—III. *Hampton Court Conference.*—IV. *Remarks on the Proceedings.*—V. *Death and Character of Whitgift: Bancroft Archbishop.*—VI. *First Parliament: Sentiments of King and Puritans relative to the Catholics.*—VII. *Convocation: Canons.*—VIII. *Conformity enforced.*—IX. *Gunpowder Plot.*—X. *Reflections on James's Conduct towards the Papists and Puritans.*—XI. *Oath of Allegiance.*—XII. *Complaints respecting the High Commission Court.*—XIII. *Death and Character of Bancroft: Abbot Archbishop.*—XIV. *Book of Sports.*—XV. *Synod of Dort.*—XVI. *State of Parties: Calvinists and Arminians.*—XVII. *Papists: and Regulations for Preaching.*—XVIII. *Death and Character of James.*—XIX. *Miscellaneous Matters: Character of the Reign: Conduct of Abbot: Convocations: Amusements of the Clergy: Form of consecrating a Church: Selden's History of Tithes.*—XX. *Acts of Parliament.*—XXI. *Learned Divines.*

I. 1603. ELIZABETH was succeeded on the English throne by James, the son of her unfortunate rival, Mary. As this monarch had been born of a Popish mother, but educated by rigid Calvinists,

the hopes of the Roman Catholic and puritanical parties were equally elevated on his accession. Both, however, speedily sustained a grievous disappointment, by finding in the new sovereign a most zealous supporter of the English ecclesiastical constitution.

Whitgift, on the death of Elizabeth, had dispatched Neville, his dean, to make professions of loyalty to James, in the name of the bishops and their clergy, and to recommend the English church to his protection and favour. In reply to this embassy, the monarch signified his intention of preserving the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, in the state in which it had been left by his predecessor; an assurance productive of the highest satisfaction, by dissipating that Scottish mist, as his approach was termed, of which the southern divines had expressed their apprehensions*.

II. An address, denominated the Millenary Petition, from the round number employed in denoting the signatures, which, though boasted of as MORE than a thousand, did not really exceed seven hundred and fifty, was presented to James, on his way to the English metropolis, by the puritan clergy of the church. It contained little more than a repetition of the old invectives. With respect to the church service, it prayed, that the cross in baptism, interrogatories addressed to in-

* Life of Whitgift, p. 559.

fants, and the office of confirmation, might be dispensed with: it complained of baptism by females, of the cap and surplice, of the ring in marriage, of the terms priest and absolution in the Liturgy; and it requested that the communion might be preceded by examination, and administered with the accompaniment of a sermon. The general length of the service, the cathedral music, the profanation of the Lord's Day, and idleness of holidays, the apocryphal books, and the bowing at the name of Jesus, were all embraced in the scope of its invective. A wish was next expressed, that only able men and diligent preachers might be henceforward admitted into the church; that non-residence might be prohibited, and that subscription might be confined solely to the articles and oath of supremacy. Commendams, pluralities, and impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges, were not omitted among the alleged grievances; while a hint was suggested that the lay impropriations should all be charged with the maintenance of a preacher. Lay excommunications, the frequency of oaths *ex officio*, and of marriage licenses, together with the length of suits in ecclesiastical courts, were the last evils of which redress was craved.

In this instrument the candid judge will not fail to perceive some improper demands, and many frivolous complaints, mingled, nevertheless, with

no small number of serious and well-grounded remonstrances. It is chiefly reprehensible in deprecating an uniformity in ecclesiastical discipline; without which it seems altogether impossible that any church could subsist in internal tranquillity.

The address having been presented, a rumour was spread abroad, that the King was favourably inclined to it: this, it is probable, originated in the wishes, and might be no deliberate fabrication, of the petitioners; but its effect was like that, in battle, of a cry of victory raised in the van, which induces the main army to follow: for a variety of similar petitions accompanied the homage paid to James, as he proceeded through the several counties. To this brood of addresses the signature of no hand provided with fingers, was refused; the pen was even guided in the subscription of young boys; and there was discovered to be a remarkable "*ubiquitariness*" of the same handwriting. Not content with that moderate pruning, which was the object of the parent address, several of these papers proposed the entire extirpation of the hierarchy.

With respect to the millenary petition, which chiefly demanded notice, it instantly ran the gauntlet throughout the whole prelatical party, every one bestowing on it a lash as it passed; some with their pens, but more with their tongues; while even those who had been called, in derision, the dumb ministers, now finding their speech, be-

came most vocal in its disparagement. Its most prominent opposers were the two universities, whose members accused the subscribers to it of hostility to the monarchical prerogative. Taking offence, as it was coarsely expressed, at the proposal for cutting off the nipples from the breasts of the *almæ matres*, in the clause respecting college impropriations, they affirmed, that although no express objection was then made to episcopacy and forms of prayer, the design of taking the place by storming the outworks, was manifest: and that the ultimate object of these millenary petitioners, was to bind their king in chains, and their prince in fetters of iron. Whether James was influenced by the same suspicions, and disapproved of the familiar language in which the complainants were accustomed to address their Creator, in prayer, as tending to abate their due respect for their earthly sovereign; or whether their austere manners, and enmity to diversions, so opposite to his own hilarity, were displeasing to him, he steadfastly adhered to the answer he had returned to the bishops; yet, desirous of conciliating the Puritans by deliberation and open inquiry, and at the same time anxious to display his theological accomplishments, he commanded all parties to abide quietly the result of a conference to be held at Hampton Court, where he proposed presiding as moderator. Though determined, as

he candidly professed beforehand, to maintain the ecclesiastical state as by law established, he promised the reformation of all such abuses as should be there clearly demonstrated to exist*.

III. 1604. In the Hampton Court conference, which continued during three days of the month of January 1604, nine bishops, and an equal number of church dignitaries, maintained a controversy with four eminent puritanical divines. These disputants were all nominated by the royal theologian; and the Puritans had too much reason to augur ill of their cause, when they found themselves opposed to a monarch already pledged to support the hierarchy, and assisted by the elite of his ecclesiastics †.

On the first day of the conference (Saturday, January 14), James opened the proceedings by declaring his great happiness in being brought into the promised land, where he was not, as formerly, braved by beardless boys; and by expressing his wish to be satisfied as to certain points relating to the worship and discipline of the church. He entertained certain scruples, he said, respecting confirmation, which seemed to intimate, that bap-

* Strype's Life of Whitgift, p. 569.

† Strype's Life of Whitgift, p. 571.—Barlow's Account of the Conference.—“Warner,” says the editor of Mosheim, “intimates the caution with which Neale's History should be read. Why, then, did he take from that author his whole account of the Hampton conference?” It is necessary to correct the mis-statements of both.

tism was not a complete sacrament without it. He wished also to be informed in what particular the Protestant and Popish absolutions differed; and whether the phrase "private baptism" alluded to the privacy of the place (since in that sense it accorded with the primitive church), or rather signified private in regard to the person, a baptism administered by midwives and laymen, which he judged to be altogether inadmissible. His Majesty was not less anxious to learn, by whom, and for what offences, excommunication was denounced; being of opinion that so exceedingly severe a censure should follow only the commission of enormous crimes; and that to pronounce it, should be the province of the bishops, with the aid of the dean and chapter, but by no means that of lay chancellors and commissaries; and lastly, he was desirous of consulting with his divines, concerning the providing of fit and able ministers for Ireland.

When James had concluded this introductory harangue, Whitgift dropped on his knee, and owned the obligations of the Church to Providence, for having placed a prince so able and sagacious at the helm of affairs. He then assured the King, that confirmation was a primitive usage, but no sacrament, and no completion or corroboration of baptism; referring to the baptismal rubric, with which James expressed himself satisfied. Bancroft subjoined, that even Calvin had

interpreted the verse (Heb. vi. 2), where "the laying on of hands" is mentioned, as a proof of confirmation's having been an apostolic usage, and that he had earnestly wished its restoration in the reformed churches.

Whitgift, having adverted to the forms of confession and absolution inserted in the communion service, a perusal of these banished his Majesty's scruples: nevertheless, for the sake of clear explanation, the assembly resolved, that, to the title "absolution" should be added, in the rubric, "or remission of sins." Excommunication in the spiritual courts, for slight offences, was softened into a censure, or other equivalent correction.

The two absolution forms, namely, the general absolution, and that private and particular one occurring in the office for visiting the sick, were both found to be retained by the German reformed churches, and approved by Calvin as free from superstition.

Baptism was admitted to be necessary to salvation; but the Archbishop assured James that no performance of that rite, by women or laics, was allowed by the church; that it was censured by the bishops; and that the rubric lent it no sanction. Bancroft, however, objected, that the compilers of the Liturgy intended to allow baptism by lay-hands in cases of emergency; and that such was the practice of the primitive church, as might be inferred from the passage in the second

chapter of Acts, since the Apostles cannot but have received assistance * in baptizing three thousand persons in one day. A debate ensuing, it was left to subsequent deliberation, whether the rubric for private baptism should not be restricted to curates and lawful ministers. Prior to this period it was customary with the bishops to grant baptizing licenses to midwives, because baptism was yet regarded in a Popish light, as in every case the *sine quâ non* of salvation. An oath, however, was taken by these accoucheuses, that they would perform the ceremony only in cases of necessity, and certify the parish curate of every such baptizing †. James now reproved the English divines for insisting too strongly on the indispensable necessity of baptism; while those of Scotland were addicted to the opposite error. He here related a repartee pronounced by him to one of the beardless boys in that kingdom, who had petulantly demanded, “Does your Majesty suppose, that if I am sent for to baptize a sick child, and refuse to go, that infant dying unbaptized will be damned?”—“If sent for under such circum-

* Twelve Apostles might, with the greatest ease, baptize three thousand persons in one day. It is but two hundred and fifty to each. I have myself administered the other sacrament in England to nearly that number in one day. Besides, might none of the seventy, or of the deacons, have been present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost?

† Strype, *Annals*, vol. i. p. 537.

stances, you delay the administration of baptism, I think," replied the monarch, "that you will be damned. In short, my Lords," he continued, "I understand, that baptism is necessary to be had, if lawfully to be had, that is, from the hands of lawful ministers, by whom alone, and by no private person in any case, ought that sacrament to be dispensed; not but that I utterly dislike all re-baptization of those whom women or laics may have already baptized. Thus acquiescing in an error which could not now be recalled, he laid down the pure doctrine and the future rule of the church, by citing the commission (Matt. xxviii. 20), "Go, and baptize all nations," as addressed exclusively to authorized ministers. He wisely thought it better, where lawful baptism was not at hand, to leave the unoffending babe to the mercy of the Father of mercies, than to debase a sacred rite by an irregular administration, of which the practice is profane, and the efficacy at least uncertain; better than to suffer the hand of an Uzzah to touch the ark, or the censer of a Korah to offer up unhallowed fire*.

* Neale asserts, that the bishops, on the first day of the conference, entreated James to alter nothing at all, lest the Puritans should complain, that till then they had been bound to forms, which were now confessed to be erroneous: one of the many statements of that prejudiced writer, which he fails to substantiate by satisfactory proofs. Galloway, whom he cites, was not admitted the first day; and as to the expression of Dean Andrew, that James played the Puritan notably,

On the second day of the conference, Monday, Jan. 16th, Raynolds, Sparks, Knewstubbs, and Chaderton, the four puritanical divines, were called in. Though all ministers of the church, they appeared in fur gowns, in the costume of Turkey merchants, while the bishops and dignitaries wore the habits of their respective distinctions. Mr. Galloway, minister of Perth, was also admitted, while the young Prince Henry sate on a low chair beside his father, like Paul at the feet of Gamaliel *.

After several preliminary observations made by the King, Dr. Raynolds, then professor of divinity in Oxford, presented the remonstrance of the puritanical party, as drawn up under four general heads. They first prayed that the doctrine of the church might be preserved in purity, meaning that the Calvinistic point of final perseverance should be established, by an insertion of the words, “not finally nor totally,” after the statement of the possibility of a fall from grace, contained in the sixteenth article. In reply, the King and Bishop of London dropped a caution respecting the danger of presumptuous sinning, in reliance on renewed

it stands on no authority; it is contradicted by the general result, and may have only been the ebullition of a violent man's displeasure, that James and his bishops should come to any parley with the malcontents.

* See Galloway's Account of the Conference.

and indefectible grace, and the propriety of our reasoning, *ascendendo*, from our obedience to our election, and not from our fancied election to our final perseverance. As the sixteenth article underwent no alteration, we may remark that this request, coupled with a desire expressed for the interpolation of the Lambeth articles, proves the said sixteenth article, as it now stands, to have been considered by these Calvinists as not calvinistic. It came out that the Lambeth articles had been framed in consequence of a dispute, not between Calvinists and the holders of Arminian principles, but between Calvinists and Antinomians; the one holding, that a man once justified, though doubtless not finally falling away from grace, relapsed by the commission of a murder, or of adultery, into a state of temporary damnation: while the others maintained, that such a character, even though prevented by forgetfulness (forgetfulness of the little venial faux pas of murder or adultery, such trifles being apt to escape the memory of the elect), or by sudden death, from repenting, continues in his state of justification.

To the second point of remonstrance, consisting of a petition, that good pastors might be appointed to preach in all churches, it was replied, that the Puritans placed religion too much in the ears; that though preaching might be mainly expedient for a newly planted church, prayer was more proper for one long established: that preach-

ers should be supplied gradually as the universities could furnish them ; for Jerusalem was not to be built up in one day ; and that, in the mean time, the clergy should read the homilies.

Raynolds further wished, that the words “ in the congregation,” contained in the twenty-third article, might be altered, in order to prevent persons not lawfully called, from preaching “ out of the congregation.” This was deemed unnecessary, since no person, it was said, could preach without a license ; yet the demand seems a reasonable one, which it would have been wiser, perhaps, to have conceded ; nor is the force of the answer, we must confess, very apparent. A contradiction was next complained of in the twenty-fifth article, relative to confirmation as an apostolic usage : but the objection was deemed a cavil grounded solely on the hope of transferring that rite to the hands of priests. This hope having been expressed by Raynolds, he was challenged to show that any, excepting bishops, had ever confirmed in the ancient church. Another proposal, that the words, “ nor ought to have any,” should, in the thirty-seventh article, be added to the declaration, that the Bishop of Rome has no authority within this realm, was obviated by the words of the King, “ Habemus jure, quod habemus ; if he has none, he has a right to none.” Much indecent raillery was occasioned by this nicety ; and Raynolds sustained the ridicule of James

and his courtiers, one of whom said, he might define a Puritan to be a Protestant frightened out of his wits. The Oxford divine, with a dignified disregard of such taunting, proceeded to suggest the propriety of adding to the articles, a declaration, that the intention of the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament: but James answered, persisting in his vein of coarse jocularity, that if every proposition negative were to be inserted in a confession of faith, a man would have to keep it, not in his head, but in his pocket-book; and that, whatever Dr. Raynolds might think concerning intention, certainly if he intended to carry away from that conference the same prejudices which he had brought to it, the quality of an intention, he might allow, was something material. We pretend not to justify this unmanly triumph over a subject, whom due respect must have awed, and a sense of decorum prohibited, from employing repartee in his defence.

The Puritans, thirdly, requested, that the church government should be sincerely ministered, agreeably to the Word of God; an artfully vague expression, which, in all probability, signified little else than a distant aim at the demolition of the hierarchy: but this point was not brought forward in detail.

In the conclusion of the remonstrance, the never-failing complaint was renewed against the Apocrypha, the cross, and the surplice; while

the agents desired that the common-prayer or communion book might be adapted to the greater increase of piety : all which requests, it is generally acknowledged, were only a circuitous effort to be delivered from subscription. In reply, it was determined, that the apocryphal writings were read as a law of morals, not as a guide of faith ; that the cross was a ceremony, like kneeling, for the promotion of piety ; that it was as old as Constantine, who was no Papist ; and that it was no more significant than the imposition of hands, which the Puritans practised in ordination ; or the ring in marriage, of which Raynolds himself had approved. The surplice, having been objected to on new grounds (for it was no longer denominated a rag of Popery, but a garb worn by the priests of Isis), its adoption, for the sake of comeliness, the sovereign argued, could be attended with no danger, since no heathens now remained.

Knewstubbs here remonstrated against the ceremonies, as indifferent, inferring that the church could not bind the conscience with respect to them, without an unwarrantable encroachment on Christian liberty. But James warmly answered, " As to the power of the church in indifferent matters, I will not argue the point with you, how far you are bound to obey : I will have one doctrine, one discipline, one religion, in substance and in ceremony."

Under this last head, a wish was expressed, for a revival of the prophesyings suppressed by Queen Elizabeth ; with reference of doubtful points to archdeaconal visitations, and thence to episcopal synods. The monarch, however, aware of the contagion of enthusiastic fervours, replied, "If you aim at a Scottish presbytery, it agrees as well with a monarchy, as heaven with hell. In such assemblies as you here call for, shall Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, meet in order to censure me and my council ; and Jack shall say, ' It must be thus ;' and Dick will answer, ' No ; I will have it thus ;' therefore you have my mind, *le Roi s'avisera* *."

* When Raynolds complained that Popish pamphlets had been distributed, Bancroft replied, " It was by sanction of the Court, to nourish the schism between the Jesuits and seculars." The same divine having spoken respectfully of the King's supremacy, James thanked the bishops for this anxiety. " It is to you, my lords, I owe it," said he ; " for, no bishop, no king. Knox told my mother in Scotland much about her supremacy, but it was only until it was exerted in distressing the Popish bishops ; and then her supremacy could not obtain for her even the indulgence of a private chapel for the exercise of her own religion."

The subject of pluralities was also touched upon : with these the Lord Chancellor found fault, on the ground, that every learned man ought to possess a single coat, before any was indulged with a doublet. " Yet doublets," replied Bancroft, " are necessary in cold weather."

The Oxford professor signified his desire, that a catechism might be compiled for the use of novices ; neither so short as

Throughout this whole discussion, which occupied four hours, the principle which actuated James and the bishops, was, that no society of Christians should separate further from the Church of Rome, either in doctrine or in ceremonies, than she had swerved from her own primitive condition. "If these be all the objections of the remonstrants," said the King, as he rose after the second day of conference, "they shall either con-

that annexed to the Liturgy, nor yet so ample as Dr. Nowel's: the King gave his assent, provided that deep questions should be omitted, and agreement with the Papists in some points not deemed a mark of heterodoxy. A proposal for a new translation of the Bible, likewise obtained the prompt concurrence of his Majesty, who pronounced a strong censure on the marginal notes attached to the Geneva edition, particularly adverting to their loose casuistry in treating concerning promises, and to a comment on Revelations, ix. 3, affirming bishops to be among the locusts from the bottomless pit. When, under the fourth title, Raynolds objected to the churching of women, by the Jewish name of purification, James, conceiving him to be hostile to the service itself, shortly answered, that as women were usually loath to come to church, any occasion was commendable which might draw them thither. This sarcasm against the sex, however, he balanced with a compliment, when a cavil was started against the words in the marriage service: "With my body I thee worship."—"It is a manner of speech, as when we say, a worshipful gentleman; and, as for you, Dr. Raynolds, allow me to hint, that many men speak of Robin Hood, before they have shot with his bow: if you had a good wife yourself, you would think all worship and honour well bestowed on her."

form, and that by compulsion, or I will harry * them out of the land, or do worse."

On the third day (Wednesday, Jan. 18th), the bishops and deans, with several civilians, were privately assembled, for the purpose of satisfying James with respect to the high commission, and the oath *ex officio*. As these formed part of the royal prerogative, it was found no difficult task to convince him of their utility. A committee of bishops and privy counsellors was then formed, who should inquire concerning the persons and causes in the high commission, punish recusants, and make a suitable provision for the clergy in every parish. After this the Puritan representatives were admitted, that they might learn the result of the meeting. This consisted only of a few slight alterations in the Liturgy; for not many, indeed, had been demanded. The baptizing of infants by women was forbidden, remission of sins inserted in the rubric of absolution, and confirmation termed an examination of children. All the thanksgivings, except the general one, were inserted in the Liturgy; to the Catechism was annexed the whole of the latter portion, relating to the two sacraments; and some words were altered in the Dominical Gospels, with the view to a new translation of the Sacred Volume.

In these improvements the Puritan divines ac-

* Not hurry, as some writers have it. Harry is a Scotch phrase, applied to the taking of bird-nests.

quiesced, expressing a disposition to obedience, and only entreating that certain ministers in Suffolk and Lancashire might be excused from wearing the surplice, and using the cross in baptism; since they could not, with any propriety, conform to these usages, having formerly reviled them from their pulpits. But James sharply replied, that uniformity, and the peace of the church, were not to be sacrificed to accommodate the scruples of a few; that objecting to measures, because to alter opinions formerly advanced would seem inconsistent, was the argument of the Scotch divines; that, however, he would there admit of no such shuffling; and, if the Puritans would not conform speedily, they should hear of it*.

IV. This full account of the conference will enable the impartial reader to detect Mr. Hume at his customary practice of mean misrepresenta-

* Thus terminated a conference, in which, to use the words of Fuller, "James went above himself, Bancroft even with himself, and Raynolds beneath himself. Whitgift spoke the most gravely; Bancroft, when out of passion, the most politicly; Eilson, Bishop of Winchester, the most learnedly: and of the divines, Raynolds the most largely; Knewstubbs most affectionately; and Chaderton most sparingly. In this scene, Dr. Sparks alone was *αφρων προσωπον*, being silent during the conference, and converted by the royal arguments." "Henceforth," adds the same witty writer, "many cripples in conformity were cured of their former halting therein, and such as knew not their own minds till they knew the King's in this matter, for the future quietly digested the ceremonies of the church."

tion and unjust ridicule: of laughing at his own lies. He seems to think that a monarch should profess no modification of religion, and should hold his immortal soul, and those of all his subjects, as subservient to political convenience. He condemns James for entering zealously into what he terms "frivolous disputes," by which he cast away the advantage of employing contempt and ridicule, the only proper method of appeasing them; but such sentiments are no more than an inference from that historian's very correct assertion, that the cross, ring, surplice, and bowing at the name of Jesus, were the ONLY subjects in debate.

When the conference came to be canvassed by the non-conformists at large, they complained that James's object was not to satisfy their scruples, but to display his own theology, and to announce his own pleasure. Their principal champion, Reynolds, they alleged, was dazzled by the presence, and daunted by the frowns, of the sovereign. Nor was the behaviour of their advocates allowed to be fairly represented, since the only report of the conference could not be otherwise than a partial one, having been drawn up by Barlow, the Dean of Chester, who, like an Israelite, was interested in sharpening the tools of his own party, and blunting those of the Philistines.

That the main source of their dissatisfaction, however, was the moderation of their own divines,

appeared soon afterwards from their petition of 1606*, in which the ceremonies, deemed by the Hampton Court remonstrants, indifferent, were pronounced actually sinful †.

V. Whitgift did not long survive these discussions. He died the spring following, in the seventy-second year of his age; having pronounced with his last breath, the words, “Pro ecclesia Dei.” In times when parties run in violent opposition, nothing is so difficult to ascertain as historical characters. Whitgift, a high churchman, and a high Calvinist, has suffered alike from the unfair detraction of Puritan and Arminian censurers. Faultless he was not, for he was a man; too ostentatious for an ecclesiastic; and in Mary’s reign, it is said, complying with the popish regimen, rather than honestly relinquishing his benefice.—“But what a monster,” I quote the venerable and weighty eloquence of an old historian—“what a monster might be made of the fairest beauty in the world, if a limner should leave what is lovely, and collect only what he findeth amiss!—I know there be a black bill in the whitest swan: yet only to insist on faults is

* See Neale, vol. i. p. 419.

† Two proclamations were issued in the following month; the one giving an account of the conference, and requiring conformity to the Liturgy and ceremonies; and the other commanding all priests and Jesuits, commissioned by foreign powers, to quit the kingdom.

a most odious employment. God, we know, so useth his fan as to keep the corn, and to drive away the chaff: but who is he that winnoweth so as to throw away the good grain, and to retain the chaff only?"

To these remarks I shall add, that in the drawing up of characters, a sort of antithetical half-praise is frequently bestowed, which has more point than truth, and injures perhaps as deeply as unqualified abuse. And when I consider that Whitgift patronized the foreign divines in England, and endowed the school of Croydon; that his house was an academy for young students; that he treated the recusants of both denominations with mildness, being attached to the government of the Catholics, and the doctrine of the Puritans; that his domestics were armed in loyalty, and first suppressed the insurrection of Essex; and that he boldly remonstrated with Elizabeth against the sacrilege of alienating the church-lands, by granting them to courtiers,—I cannot esteem it just or generous to designate him, with some writers, as a man "more learned than tolerant, more hospitable than charitable, and more magnificent than meek." He was succeeded in the primacy, Dec. 4, 1604, after a vacancy of nine months, by Bancroft, Bishop of London; who reinforced by his suggestions, the notions entertained by James respecting the arbitrary power of the English sovereign.

VI. James opened his first parliament with an harangue of great sense and merit: in which he stated that he found three religions within his realm; that by law established; the Catholic, or more properly the Popish; and, lastly, that of the Puritans, a sect lurking within the bowels of the church. He confessed the Catholic to be the mother church, though tainted with various blemishes and corruptions;—he wished to abolish all rigorous statutes in force against its members;—and professed his willingness to meet them half way in any plausible scheme for re-union.

With these sentiments all parties were alike dissatisfied. Bare toleration contented not the Catholics: the Puritans deemed themselves calumniated and insulted; while the members of the church in general expressed their disgust at the proposed concessions to the Papists, and at the idle plan for a midway conciliation. The parliament, chiefly consisting, in the lower house, of Puritans, petitioned James for a relaxation of ecclesiastical laws; and being suspicious of him, they passed a bill, disabling the crown, or courtiers through the medium of the crown (a shift which the statute of Elizabeth had left them), from receiving conveyances of land belonging to the bishoprics. To this, James readily assented: glad, perhaps, to silence the importunity with which his courtiers solicited, and to impose a check on

that facility with which he was himself too much disposed to grant, favours injurious to the church*.

VII. In the convocation of the same year, a book of one hundred and forty-one canons, collected out of the articles, injunctions, and synodical acts, published in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, passed both chambers, after some debate. It contained all the canons now in force, together with several others, since expunged by an act of parliament for granting indulgence to dissenters. Neale inveighs against them as bearing hard against the Puritans; but those which he produces only evince the claim of the church (the reasonable claim of any society whatever) to excommunicate or deprive of its privileges such persons as refuse conformity to its regulations†.

VIII. Bancroft, on his accession to the metropolitan chair, rigorously urged conformity to the rubric, and to the canons recently established. About the same time the judges, whom the King had consulted, determined, that it was lawful for the high commissioners to deprive Puritan ministers, for non-conformity to the ceremonies which

* Provision was also made by the legislature, for the rigorous prosecution of recusants; the act of Mary against the marriage of the clergy was repealed; and all processes, citations, and judgments in the spiritual court, were directed to be issued in the King's name, and to bear his seal.

† It has been several times determined in Westminster Hall, that these canons bind only the clergy, the laity not being represented in convocation.

these canons had prescribed. Encouraged by this decision, the Primate prepared for assailing the obnoxious irregulars with fresh violence. He found not the London clergy, however, disposed to second his design : for, having been summoned to Lambeth, that they might repeat their subscription to the three articles of Whitgift, agreeably to the letter of the thirty-sixth canon, “ that they subscribed willingly and from the heart,”—many withdrew themselves, and others refused their signatures. The court, who had hitherto believed the number of non-conformists to be trifling, were now alarmed at the prospect of a scarcity of preachers for the churches : and till a succession of conforming clergy could be obtained from the universities, it was deemed expedient for the present to relax the severity of the exaction in regard to the cross and surplice. The bishops were instructed, in a pastoral letter from the Primate, to grant a delay to the subscription of persons already fixed in churches ; yet on no account to admit any one, without subscription, to the discharge of ecclesiastical functions. Some among the Puritan clergy made a verbal promise of conformity, though they declined repeating their subscription : and to such it was that time was now afforded for deliberation. Others positively refused both subscription and conformity ; and directions were issued, that these, if lecturers, should be silenced ; if beneficed persons, deprived. Much has been

spoken concerning the severities inflicted in pursuance of these instructions ; although, in fact, the number of deprived ministers amounted to no more than thirty-nine. Alarmed, however, by such examples, many of the non-conformists made an attempt to expatriate themselves, and to seek, on transatlantic shores, an undisturbed exercise of their religion. In an evil hour the Archbishop obtained from James a proclamation, throwing difficulties in the way of this colonizing spirit : a most impolitic measure, as appeared in the sequel ; for the river, hindered in this manner from disemboguing itself, swelled not long afterwards above its banks, and poured over the country in a deluge of devastation.

IX. A.D. 1605. While the Puritans sustained this unexpected disappointment, James manifested no greater tenderness of indulgence towards the adherents of the old religion. In his first parliament he had avowed his determination to banish all such persons as maintained the papal supremacy. The Roman Catholics perceived, that, by means of this threatened expulsion, their numbers would be materially weakened ; nor were they disposed, as a body, to rest satisfied with the offer of toleration, accepted by their more conforming members. Under these circumstances they hatched a diabolical scheme for the destruction of the sovereign and nobility. Of this it were frivolous to introduce the details : gunpowder plot, discovered

A. D. 1605, being familiar to all readers of the civil history of England. James, in addressing his parliament, assembled a few days subsequently to the failure of this infernal machination, carefully and candidly exculpated the more moderate Roman Catholics; adding, that such Papists alone could be concerned in it, as acknowledged the Pope's authority to depose and murder princes. "We therefore," said he, "confess, that many Papists, especially our forefathers, laying their only trust upon Christ and his merits, may be saved: detesting, in that point, the cruelty of the Puritans, and thinking it worthy of fire, who will allow no salvation to any Papists."

X. That ever-liberal and impartial historian, Mr. Neale, declares, that "whether this plot had succeeded or failed, it was intended to throw blame on the Puritans." A fine supposition! and immediately after affirming, too, that the design had been long known to the court. By whom was this intended? Not surely by the Papists: for, either in the failure or success of the plot, the result would have discovered THEMSELVES alone as the agents. Still less could the King and courtiers harbour such an intention. If the plot had succeeded, who does not see, that they would not have been in a condition to throw the blame upon any party? and how, moreover, does their conduct, under the actual issue, tally with Mr. Neale's

imputation? They very prudently DID NOT suffer the plot to succeed: and then their mode of casting the blame on the Puritans, was to bring to trial and to execute all the Catholics concerned. An annual thanksgiving for deliverance (from the Puritans, of course), was appointed to be celebrated; while an act of parliament compelled all persons to attend the church, under the penalty of twelvepence for each offence.

In fact, the King inclined, though in a slight degree, towards the Papists and Puritans by turns; deeming it politic to play off the one against the encroachments of the other. In the mean time the Puritans were continually calling out, "Popish plots;" which perhaps did not even exist in their own imagination; and while establishing themselves in parliament, they presented so formidable a phalanx, that James was compelled to court them on nearly all important measures. Nothing indeed could more clearly evince his judgment than this cautious vigilance and temperate indulgence manifested towards all parties. He could not forget that men, capable of hatching so diabolical a scheme as the gunpowder plot, were not habitual villains, but principled bigots, and in all other respects unexceptionable characters; that they had sealed their mutual faith by a participation of the Eucharist; that when a doubt was started relative to the impropriety of destroying friends to-

gether with foes*, the Jesuit Garnet had asserted the lawfulness of the measure; that the populace believed miracles to be wrought by the body of this wretch, and that in Spain he was regarded as a martyr. Though these facts might justly warrant, it must be owned, both severity and suspicion on the part of government, yet, since they were chargeable only on a small, and the least honourable part of the Catholic body, the speech of James, discriminating the deserving from the dangerous, was wise, politic, generous, and humane.

XI. 1606. On the discovery of this plot, the oath of allegiance was framed; being a vow of submission to the King as a temporal sovereign, independent on any other power upon earth: another proof that the blame was cast upon the Puritans! This instrument differs from the oath of supremacy; which asserts the King to be head of the church, as well as of the state. It was, therefore, a liberal and merciful act towards the Catholic body; and has been praised by Mr. Hume for its moderation, in deciding no controverted points betwixt the two religions. Blackwell, the Popish archpresbyter, and most English Catholics, in fact, cordially acquiesced, in defiance of the

* In the Gospel, says Fuller, the tares were suffered to grow for the sake of the corn; but here the corn is plucked up on account of the tares.

Pope's prohibition, and of Bellarmine's sophistical reasoning*.

On the conduct of James, with reference to the religious parties, various comments have been delivered by different historians, each dictated by the prejudices of the writer. By some his gentle treatment of his Catholic subjects has been attributed to moderation and magnanimity; while others will give him credit for no nobler motive than his dread of the future designs of that body. In a sober and unbiassed estimate of his character, it will perhaps appear that both of these censures are overcharged, and that James was a man of sound orthodoxy and plain sense, actuated by a prudent anxiety to hold a middle course betwixt extremes, in which he discerned evils equally formidable; his seat on the throne being rendered insecure by the doctrines connected with a belief in the papal supremacy, and the throne itself not less unstable, by the antimonarchical principles of many Puritans. His general character as a theologian, moreover, and his sensible inquisitiveness at the conference of Hampton Court, evince that he was

* Blackwell was some time afterwards deposed by the Pope, for having taken this oath of a loyal and good subject. Bellarmine wrote under a feigned name, and was answered by James in a laboured treatise. See Collier's Records, p. 105—Bellarmine's Letter against the Oath of Allegiance, 1607—and Pope Paul's Brief to the English Roman Catholics, forbidding them to take the oath of allegiance.

by no means indifferent as to the opinions in divinity maintained by the opposite parties; that he regarded them with equal jealousy, though less in a religious than in a political point of view; and that, far from entertaining any bigoted antipathy to either, he approached the one and the other in the truths which they professed, and stood aloof from their respective errors.

With what justice Bishop Burnet affirms, that to the end of his reign he continued speaking and writing against Popery, and acting in favour of it, neither appears from facts, nor from any inference of reason. If he had been really influenced by dread of assassination from the Catholics, agreeably to the allegation of that historian, would not the same apprehension which restrained his conduct, have imposed a check upon his words and writings? Would a friend of Catholics, and an enemy of war, have ruined his private finances in supporting his protestant son-in-law? Would he have consented to a rupture with Spain? Would he have exhorted his son, amidst the seriousness and sincerity of his deathbed, to be constant in his religion, and to protect the church of England? But James, observing a middle course, had few friends in an age of violence. All his sober measures, for the support of the hierarchy, were construed by the Scottish Presbyterians and English Puritans, as testifying an inclina-

tion to Popery. Let candour wipe away the aspersion*.

XII. 1610. The Commons, in the parliament of 1610, attacked the ecclesiastical branch of the royal prerogative, by complaining of the High Commission Court and the oath *ex officio*; and censured the spiritual courts for depriving such of the clergy as had refused to extend their subscription beyond the strict requisition of the statute. But James, on hearing the report of these contents, summoned the Lords and Commons to attend him at Whitehall; where, to an introductory flourish on the divine right of kings, he added, that he was ever willing to assign a reason for his conduct, and to govern according to law.

Neither satisfied with this promise, however, nor dismayed by the antecedent doctrine of absolute authority, the Commons presented to the Sovereign a remonstrance, asserting their right of debate concerning the prerogative of his Majesty

* Bancroft, about this time, made another attempt to transfer prohibitions from the King's court to his Majesty's own hands; but the scheme having been strenuously opposed by the judges, the King, how anxious soever for its execution, was afraid to proceed. Prohibitions were writs issued by the temporal, to stop the proceedings of the spiritual courts, on the suggestion of an interference with their province. Before the Reformation they were eminently useful, in resisting the tyranny of the Popes; but afterwards became vexatious and expensive to the clergy, by being granted on frivolous grounds.

and the privileges of the subject. But their clamours for liberty were the cries of intolerance, since, while they petitioned for the restoration of those Puritan clergy who had withheld subscription to the added articles—while they represented as grievances, pluralities and non-residence, the High Commission Court, and excommunication for light offences—they rounded the period of their complaints with a demand for an execution of the laws against the Papists. Such boldness could not fail to be highly displeasing to a monarch nurtured in all the prejudices of arbitrary power. In a little while he dissolved this refractory parliament; nor did he seem anxious for the speedy assembling of another.

With respect to the Papists, chance occasioned that severity which the Commons had been unable to obtain by their entreaties: for an alarm having been spread abroad, in consequence of the assassination of Henry IV. by Ravailiac, all Catholic priests were commanded to quit the kingdom.

XIII. Although James had brought from Scotland his high notions of the kingly government, they were greatly flattered and confirmed by Bancroft; who, on his decease in 1610, left the metropolitan throne to be occupied by Abbot, Bishop of London; a prelate less alive to the dangers which threatened the hierarchy*. Of Archbishop

* Bishop Andrews had been the primate-elect; and so secure was he of his appointment, that he retired into the coun-

Bancroft Lord Clarendon has observed, that “He understood the church exceedingly well: that he had almost rescued it out of the hands of the Calvinian party, and subdued the unruly spirit of the non-conformists; that he countenanced men of learning, and disposed the clergy to a more solid course of study than they had been accustomed to*.” By the counsel of this primate, James founded a college at Chelsea, for twenty learned divines; to be employed in defending the established religion against errors and heresies †.

try. The Earl of Dunbar seized the occasion to smuggle Abbot into the archbishopric: and it was owing to the favour shown by him to the non-conformists, that the subsequent reduction of that body to obedience was deemed an innovation.

* His economy was, by an easy and common change of a word, pronounced by his enemies to be covetousness; as appears from the following satirical epitaph:

Here lies his Grace, in cold clay clad,

Who died for want of what he had.

† Bancroft likewise offered to the parliament a projet for increasing the maintenance of the clergy: proposing that prædial tithes might be paid in kind; that oblations on funeral and other occasions should be restored; that lands altered from tillage should pay according to their former value; that the occupiers of parishes depopulated should pay tithes to the nearest poor parishes; that adjacent small parishes should be consolidated; that parsons should have right of common; that ministers in towns should have tithes according to the rents in London; that tithe-wood should be paid; that the mortmain act should be overlooked, so far as relates to lands added to the glebe; that lay patrons should take the oath against

XIV. While the Puritan party had cast a gloom over religion, the Jesuits in Lancashire had drawn many to Popery by representing such austere manners as incompatible with Christian liberty. To oppose the one and the other, James published a declaration, entitled the Book of Sports: in which he attempted to prove that games and exercises, such as dancing or archery, though not bear-baiting, interludes, or bowling, are lawful on

simony; that it should be simony to sell advowsons, as well as presentations; that parsons might take leases for lives; that lands gained from the sea should become titheable; that impropriations should be redeemed, and annexed to the diocesan's patronage; that poor vicarages should be enriched out of these impropriations, and that mortuaries should be restored. It was further suggested, that large livings should be divided; that lords of manors might increase glebes to twenty acres out of waste lands; that novalia of hops, iron, coals, &c. should be titheable to the vicar, and not the impropriator; that garden-stuffs be titheable, in addition to the tithe penny; that where mead silver used to be paid, the hay should be titheable to the vicar; that milk should be titheable, though the owner have less than seven calves; that frauds of keeping cattle in different parishes should be avoided; that parsons might have pasturage in the royal parks; that the first fruits of poor vicarages should be remitted; that the minister might farm the impropriation; that a parson should not demise the house, glebe, or tithes, to the patron; that no leases, granted by incumbents, should hereafter be confirmed by the bishop or patron.—When we recollect that this was a budget presented to parliament, for which they were themselves to furnish the chief supplies, we need not wonder that they received it with coldness, and that the attempt totally failed.

Sunday, after evening service: and forbade that any of his subjects, EXCEPT PAPISTS, should be molested in the enjoyment of them. At this edict, the serious part of the community were greatly scandalized; and Abbot had even the boldness to forbid its being read at Croydon. That the lower classes should taste the sweets of cheerful relaxation, and enjoy every innocent indulgence, must be the wish of all sober and rational Christians. Compassion will also remember that many among them are condemned, during six days in the week, to hard labour, frequently in uncleanly employments, or in close, dark, and unhealthy factories or workshops. Too austere, therefore, appears the zeal of those, who seek to interdict the labourer from a Sabbath evening's walk, from a friendly visit, or from sober conversation; provided the former part of the day have been religiously spent, and time be left before the hour of rest for exercises of domestic and private devotion. But while the afternoon of Sunday might not perhaps be unhallowed when thus passed by the labourer, no terms but of censure seem apposite to the other extreme, inculcated in the Book of Sports, whatever be the games or diversions which it encourages. The Sabbath is a day of solemnity as well as of rest; and the relaxations of the evening should be of a nature not widely discordant from the serious employment of the earlier part of the day:—not

calculated to obliterate impressions that may then have been made. Boisterous mirth should be universally prohibited, on the ground of decorum, and of respect for the sacred institution. With reference to the higher classes, they can justly claim no such indulgence, as we here incline to extend to the poor and laborious. Their whole week is a Sabbath of recreation, a circle of diversions; the history of it is a book of sports. They require a pause for reflection, and a long pause: nor is there hardship in excluding them even from several indulgences conceded to their humbler brethren. What! cannot they watch one hour? Cannot the wheel stand still for one whole day?—Betwixt a duty and a fault, there must necessarily be chalked out a broad and distinguishable line of demarcation; and surely it is desirable that that line should recede, in some degree, from the extreme limit of allowable indulgence; rather than that, by approaching, the Christian should be tempted to transgress it; the perishable creature to lose remembrance of his mortality; the sinful creature, of his frailty; the candidate for heaven and the child of God, to forget his dignity, his destination, and his duties. The dedication of the whole Sabbath to religious and serious exercises, must therefore be recommended to the higher classes in society, since indulgences which they are apt to deem innocent and allowable, lead on imperceptibly to unhallow-

ings of that sacred day, hardly to be palliated, certainly not to be vindicated, on any plea which would not extend to the most scandalous licentiousness. If promenades, if conversazioni, be once admitted, shall not ordinary music, a sober game at cards, an uninvited company, be deemed equally innocent? Yes! And if profane music, why not an opera? if promiscuous company, why not an assembly?—if cards, wherefore not five hundred votaries of fashion, and a thousand servants blaspheming in the streets?

With respect to the license given by James, it was limited by an order, that sports should not be held during divine service; and that such as absented themselves from service, or from their own parishes, should not have the benefit of the indulgence. But at the best, the indulgence was reprehensible and ridiculous: for the dancers and archers would think it hard to be deprived of their bowling: and with reason; for bowling is a more grave amusement than dancing, and not more a game than archery. The exception of the Popish recusants was a vile act of tyranny: for, if the sports were right in themselves, the Papists, approving of them, ought to have first shared the indulgence.

But what observes Mr. Hume on this subject? for surely, on such a subject, his wit will not be silent. “The Puritans,” we are acquainted by him, “AFFECTED to call Sunday the Sabbath.”

If this be affectation, the fourth commandment must be altered; and the new reading will then accordingly stand thus:—"Remember Sunday, to keep it unholy." We are next told of the exemplary piety and sound understanding of one Shepherd, who defended dancing on the Sabbath; we beg pardon—on Sunday, by gravely reminding the House of Commons, that King David danced before the ark: and this, to justify all the drinking, swearing, rioting, harlotry, and debauchery, attending a three-penny hop in Saint Giles's or the Borough.

The Book of Sports was withdrawn for the present, and again brought forward in 1618.—Its design was then said to be that of making the Papists Protestants, by compulsion; and to prevent the Protestants from becoming Papists, by encouragement. O wise!

XV. In 1618 was held that famous synod of Dort, which arrived at more absurd conclusions than any Popish council that ever corrupted the purity of the faith. To the judgment of this tribunal the Arminians, or Remonstrants, demurred; seeing their leaders were in custody, and in numbers they were unequal to the Calvinists. The synod consisted of sixty-one divines, of whom not more than three or four were Remonstrants. To these were added twenty-eight foreign divines, mostly of the same stamp. Each provincial synod gave one collective vote. Of the 180 sessions of

this assembly, it were vain to attempt giving here even a sketch ; yet its proceedings are too important to be passed by in entire silence.

For some time the Reformed in the Belgic provinces had been divided into Remonstrants and Counter-remonstrants ; a division which originated in a tract, entitled Perkins's *Armilla Aurea* ; on the supra-lapsarian doctrines of predestination contained in which, James Van Harmen, or ARMINIUS, publicly animadverted. This celebrated person died in 1609. His adherents, the following year, addressed a REMONSTRANCE to the states of Holland ; but this continued for some time unanswered ; at length, the controversy, reduced to five points, was referred to a synod, held in Dort, A. D. 1618-19. Four English divines attended this synod, and were allowed by the States ten pounds a day. One of these was Bishop Hall ; but he soon returned on account of indisposition, James likewise commissioned a deputy for the Church of Scotland. The English deputies protested against the Belgic or Presbyterian discipline ; while they assented to the absurdities of its doctrine. The reply of the States affords a remarkable illustration of the fact, that episcopacy and monarchy are congenial. They admired, they said, and envied, the establishment of the English church ; but their civil government rendered an imitation of that model impracticable. To this reason may be added, as another, their unwilling-

ness to part with the spoils of their sacrilege. On their revolt from Spain, the mitre had been sent to the mint, to keep the new exchequer in cash; and a staff had been provided instead of the crosier. A cheap religion, and a poor clergy, is well known to be the sure way to check the freedom of the pulpits; and to prevent all disquietude to the frauds of merchandise and the vices of luxury*.

James commissioned Calvinist divines to attend this synod, not as being himself a Calvinist, but as swayed by reasons of state; and chiefly by personal friendship towards Prince Maurice, who had put himself at the head of the counter-remonstrants.

Yet Neale has the impudence to call the synod of Dort a candid and venerable body; and affirms that James's sending bishops where a presbyter

* Collier, in alluding to Bishop Pearson's proof of the genuineness of Ignatius's letters, asks, would that martyr, who accounts the episcopal office so necessary to the Church, have attended this irregular synod? Would those bishops who drew up the thirty-seventh and thirty-ninth apostolical canons, have allowed a conciliatory capacity to a company of presbyters? "A parity of ministry," he adds, "is a revolt from the practice of 1500 years; nor have the words Protestant and Reformed any authority to turn spiritual legislation into a new channel." In this synod the English were four court divines, instructed by the King: and as they had no delegation from the bishops, they were no representatives of the church; nor can what was there done affect the English communion.

presided, was an acknowledgment of the validity of ordination by mere presbyters*.

While Calvinists were loud in their praises of this synod, the Arminian party ridiculed it in the following distich:—

Dordrecht synodus, nodus; chorus integer, æger;

Conventus, ventus; sessio, stramen, amen.

On the extent of Christ's redemption, the British divines omitted the received and orthodox distinction betwixt its sufficiency and its efficacy; and adverted not to the art of confining the phrase, "He died for the whole world," to the world of the elect. Davenant and Ward in fact were Semi-arminians on this head. They secretly maintained the certainty of the salvation of God's elect; but believed that offers of pardon were sent to all who heard the Gospel; and that sufficient grace was imparted, to convince and persuade the disobedient, so as to throw the blame of their impenitence upon themselves. They considered that Christ's merits were applicable to these; and, consequently, that their salvation was possible and contingent.

Nevertheless, they generally complied with the synod of Dort; and declared the confession, in the main, agreeable to the word of God. Hence

* See Lewis de Moulin, Womack, Heylin, and Brandt.

a report arose some years after, that they had deserted the doctrine of the Church of England *.

XVI. 1621. In the year 1621 James assembled a parliament, from whom he solicited money, avowedly for the support of his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, recently elected king of Bohemia; nor were aids destined to support the Protestant cause, refused, or reluctantly bestowed. Two very different orders, the enemies of arbitrary power, and the Calvinistic objectors to ceremonies, had now coalesced, and were together distinguished by the name of Puritans. To oppose this formidable party, the King, whose Calvinistic prejudices (if he ever entertained them) had yielded to a sound theology, united the Arminians and those Church Papists, who inculcated the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance. In these parties and their mutual animosities, we observe the germ of the distinctions, Whig and

* 1619. Frederic, the Elector Palatine, and James's son-in-law, received, without that monarch's advice, the crown of Bohemia, from the Protestant electors, who were Calvinists: but James refused to acknowledge his title, since elective kingdoms were established on Puritan principles. Abbot, however, being inclined to Calvinism, supported Frederic in his claims: James was not disposed to make religion a cause of dethroning kings; and he therefore permitted a voluntary subscription to secure the preservation of the Palatinate. As the Elector Palatine projected the confederacy of Calvinistic princes, James's coldness, while it gratified the Lutherans, was received by the Puritans with disgust.

Tory, High and Low Church, and court and country party, which so long prevailed; preserving, by their opposite forces, the constitution in equilibrio between privilege and prerogative. James, in his opening speech, acquainted this parliament, that he would suffer neither the Puritans nor the Jesuits to range at discretion. Now broke out those unhappy differences betwixt the King and Commons, relative to the extent of the prerogative, which led, in the succeeding reign, to so fatal an issue. It is the anxious wish of the writer of this history, whose ambition is general utility, to abstain, as much as is possible, from political questions, concerning which the suffrages of men are divided. It seems, however, impracticable to draw up an ecclesiastical narrative of transactions under the Stewart dynasty, without touching slightly on the character and conduct of the several princes composing it; and with respect to James, the present opportunity may be seized, of observing, that, previous to his reign, the English constitution had never been accurately defined; and that, if he stretched his notions of the royal prerogative further than was strictly consistent with the liberty of the subject, we must regard him as conceiving it his duty to transmit to his heirs, a sceptre, not divested of any of that power with which it had been swayed by his predecessors, the arbitrary family of Tudor. There seems no necessary connexion be-

twixt Calvinism and civil liberty, or between the doctrines of Arminius and despotical maxims: these two partnerships, however, happened to be entered into at this juncture. It has been affirmed, that political liberty derived benefit from its union with Puritanism; but it is just as likely that the cause of Puritanism gained ground by being linked, for the time, with the growing and popular rage for encroaching on the power of the monarch.

It is extremely difficult for a writer, who seeks to preserve his narrative untainted by party-spirit, and undebased by misrepresentation, to ascertain the truth amidst the contending accounts of historians, whom he consults and compares as authorities, and to refrain from imbibing their prejudices. If Mr. Collier be found half a Catholic in the latter part of his History, Dr. Warner becomes an outrageous advocate of the Puritans; and Neale himself has not, and could not have, written a more partial and distorted account of the affairs of this period. It is, indeed, ridiculous to hear him insisting so strongly and so repeatedly on James's secret attachments, and avowed hostility, to the Papists; an inconsistency for which no satisfactory motive or reason can be assigned. The truth seems to be, that James, in the beginning of his reign, entertained an equal jealousy of the Jesuits and the Puritans, and was determined to stand equally aloof from both; but that the increasing

strength and boldness of the latter body, together with their wild demands of an indefinite liberty, compelled him to seek for support to his throne, in the arms of the Arminians and moderate Papists. This juncture of affairs brought into favour Laud, the head of the Arminian party, who was promoted to the see of St. David's. The promotion of Buckridge, Neile, and Harsnet, also added strength to the Arminians.

The pulpit was now converted by both parties into an engine of political hostility and recrimination; and the salvation of souls was too much neglected, while points more proper for parliamentary debate than for religious meditation, were discussed before the people. In a sermon, delivered at St. Mary's, in Oxford, 1622, the preacher, Knight, advanced the doctrine, "that subordinate magistrates might lawfully make use of force, and defend themselves, the commonwealth, and the true religion, against the chief magistrate when he turns tyrant; when he forces the subject on blasphemy and idolatry; and when resistance is the only expedient to save their lives, their fortunes, and the liberty of their consciences." This was mooted an extreme case with a vengeance. But had any such crisis arisen in the reign of James, within the English realm? and if not, how desperately wicked must that man be, who can preach contention from the oracle of peace; who can prematurely and needlessly inflame the

popular fury, and blow aloud the trumpet of rebellion in Zion! A doctrine so bold could not pass without reprehension: the preacher was imprisoned; his notes were burnt; and the university passed a decree in convocation, affirming "that it was not lawful for subjects to appear offensively in arms against their sovereign on the score of religion, or on any other account, agreeably to the word of Scripture." This declaration all graduates and candidates for degrees were directed to subscribe*.

XVII. 1623. Proposals for a toleration of Papists were now generally agitated. It was urged that this was due to peaceable and loyal subjects: that France tolerated the Hugonots; that the king of Spain ought to be conciliated; that truth needs not fear error; that the pageantry of Popery would

* It was an object which James had very much at heart, to temper the gloomy austerity of fanaticism in Scotland, by the introduction of simple ceremonies, capable of pleasing the mind, without departing from the spirit of the Reformation. But instrumental music, it was found, had no charms for the ears of the Scottish clergy, by whom it was regarded, as were the surplice, paintings in churches, and all prescribed rites, as badges of Anti-christ, and appurtenances of idolatrous worship. Happily, it is not our province to travel across the Tweed: for we could not refresh our minds with finding in Scotland, at that period, any appearance of the meek temper of Christianity†.

† See Calamities of Authors for some remarks on the literary and moral character of James, which I am glad to find are in unison with my own.

sufficiently expose it to ridicule; that rivalship would act as a spur to the Protestant clergy; and that the having already conceded a partial, proved the propriety of affording a still more enlarged, toleration. To these arguments the anti-tolerants replied, that Papists were only more submissive through policy, and retained all their dangerous notions as to deposition of kings, &c.; and that in France, toleration had been yielded to the Hugonots through fear. The King of Heaven, they observed, is to be served, before the king of Spain. Though truth be stronger than falsehood, the latter supplies its want of strength by its activity. The multitude did not reason, and might be ensnared by the splendours of Popery. That is strange policy which admits the wolf, for the sake of increasing the vigilance of the shepherd. In fine, if the Papists are already tolerated, they have what they ought to have, and should be satisfied. These latter arguments were chiefly delivered from the pulpit, a pulpit which now stood in need of a corrective hand. "The people's duty was preached to the King at court, and the King's to the people in the country. Sermons were converted into satires against Papists and non-conformists: and preachers, treating the profound subject of predestination, were themselves bewildered in attempting to lead their flocks. To remedy these mischiefs, as well as to abate the violence of the Arminian and Calvinistic controversy, James is:

sued directions for the resumption of catechizing in the afternoon, and ordered that preachers should abide by texts warranted by the thirty-nine articles and book of homilies; that in the afternoon of Sundays the discourse should illustrate the Catechism, Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments; that no preacher under the degree of bishop or dean, should harangue a popular auditory on the topics of predestination, universal redemption, irresistible grace, or the limits of the sovereign power; that they should adhere to the topics of faith and good works, and abstain from invectives against Papists or Puritans. He likewise directed that the preaching licenses should only be directed in future by the courts of faculties, on recommendation from the bishops in the respective dioceses of the applicants. Against these directions a violent outcry was raised: man was alleged to have forbidden what God enjoined; starving souls had but one meal a-day, with a mess of milk for supper; predestination, the tree of life, was pronounced a forbidden fruit, and the Word of God had, what God himself had not, respect of persons. Papists and Puritans were linked together, while the precedence of honour was given to the former. Lecturers, the flower of piety, were discouraged.

The King's friends, however, were not remiss in replying, that a prudential regulation amounted not to a prohibition of preaching; that babes

composed the majority of a congregation, and milk was their proper food; and that predestination, which should, in truth, be an antidote against despair, was converted by preachers into a poison. In answer to the remaining objections, it was stated, that bishops and deans were men of age and experience; and cathedral auditories more intelligent than village congregations; that the mentioning of the Papists before the Puritans pointed them out as the more obnoxious offenders; and that lecturers were not recognised in the Church of England, being usually non-conformists and irregular persons, who supplanted the incumbents in the affections of their people.

XVIII. 1624. On the 24th of March James was seized with a tertian ague, which speedily brought his life to a close. He bore his last sickness with resignation and piety. Having rehearsed the Creed, received the eucharist, assured his attendants how much that viaticum had tranquilized and refreshed his spirit, and declared his being in charity with all men, he quietly resigned his spirit: *intrepidus emisit animam beatam* *. That this prince wished to tolerate the Papists, seems the unpardonable offence in the eyes of several historians, which has stamped him in their contracted volumes with the opprobrious title of the weakest and worst of kings. That he was

* Laud's Diary.

not ashamed to scrutinize and mistrust his own theological opinions, or to open his eyes to the rational doctrines of Arminianism; that in his jealousy of the Puritans he did not fly to the extreme of Popery; and that in any severity which he exercised against either Puritan or Popish recusants, he considered their political, and not their religious sentiments, ought to conciliate towards him all enlightened minds. His attachment to handsome favourites seems to have sprung from an opinion that the countenance is the index of the heart: for it is mentioned by Grainger, that the appellation Stenney, which he bestowed on the Duke of Buckingham, was a contraction of Stepheny, and alluded to that passage in the history of the first martyr, which describes his face as the face of an angel. Mild, humane, affable, generous, temperate, he possessed a mind, neither influenced by ambition, nor rendered sordid by avarice. His literary talents were by no means contemptible; and, in the judgment of Mr. Pope, his version of the Psalms is the best in the English language. His theological acquirements qualified him to take a leading part in the religious controversies of his age, and preserved him from being a dupe to the designs of any artful political ecclesiastic. All his observations at Hampton Court were sagacious; and with the penetration of a strong intellect, he perceived the hypocrisy of that zeal which the Puritans pretended for the

honour of his supremacy ; while he foresaw the danger to which the monarchy would be exposed, when the fence of the hierarchy should be broken down. On the third day of the conference he is reported to have discoursed, to the unfeigned admiration of all the civilians. Nor did he show himself less prudently jealous of Catholic interference. Pending the negotiations for the Spanish match, he was particularly anxious that the English worship should not suffer in any way. His reign, in short, because the narrative of it is not stained with battles, or with accounts of the artifices of cabinets, makes no figure in the pages of civil history. The monarch himself is usually held up to contempt, as a pusillanimous and prating pedant. Surely, however, honour ought to attend that prince's memory, whom the worst censure distinguishes as too fond of peace ; and accuses of pushing to excess his favourite pursuit—to study the eternal interests of his subjects. “ Un des grands vices de l'histoire est, qu'elle n'est interessante que par les révolutions ; les catastrophes ; tant qu'un peuple croit prospère dans le calme d'un paisible gouvernement, elle n'en dit rien. Il n'y a que les méchans de célèbres ; les bons sont oubliés ou tournés en ridicule *.”

In illustration of this remark, Bishop Burnet denominates James, the scorn of the age, a mere

* Rousseau.

pedant, without true judgment, courage, or steadiness ; and whose reign was a continued course of mean practices. Yet even Neale, with whom he cannot be supposed to have been a favourite, in affirming that he was a profane swearer, and would frequently get drunk, admits, that, on coming to himself, he would weep like a child, and say, he hoped God would not impute to him his infirmities. But, perhaps, the testimony of a greater name, that of Lord Bacon, will vindicate the injured character of this monarch. That illustrious man compares the mind of James to the sand of the sea ; vast in its bulk, yet small in its parts ; and honours him with the name of Hermes Trismegistus ; who united the sovereignty of the prince, the illumination of the priest, and the learning of the philosopher *.

* De Augmentis Scientiarum.

In the court of high commission, a supreme tribunal of appeal from inferior ecclesiastical courts, infraction of the Act of Uniformity by the clergy, had been punished, during the reign of Elizabeth, with deprivation, fine, confiscation, and imprisonment ; but James contented himself with deprivation alone, and extended even this punishment to only a small number of ecclesiastics—See Hume's Appendix to James. In vindication of this mitigated, but just severity, Mr. Hume reasonably asks, Ought any man to accept of an office, or benefice, in an establishment, while he declines compliance with the fixed and known rules of that establishment ?

1611. James solicited the States that they might not entertain Vorstius, who had published a book in which he ascribed to God a body, and subjection to accidents and limitations. In this interference he professed himself actuated by zeal and charity,

It is certain that James was, at no period of his reign, entirely in the Calvinistic persuasion. Bancroft, Barlow, Neile, Overall, Harsnet, Houson, Carey, Buckridge, and Laud, were all enemies to Calvinism. Among other derisive slanders, it has been pretended, that the shock sustained by Mary at the murder of Rizzio, affected the fœtus, and gave it an overbalance of fear : yet James grappled with an assassin in the Gowry conspiracy, and on other occasions afforded manifest proof of courage. But he had too much of the Christian temper to

not less than by a dread lest these heterodoxies should cross the seas. The royal pen styled Vorstius an arch heretic, a pest, and monster of blasphemies. It is worthy of remark, that that pure historian, Neale, inserts the word Arminian between "cursed" and "heresies," in James's letter.

But how far it was from James's personal intention, to moot publicly the disputed points, may be gathered from other parts of his conduct. It is true that he ratified the Irish articles; but on that occasion Protestantism suffered through the dread of Popery. A man who chooses the least of two evils, or who opposes one extreme by another, is not to be regarded as approving perfectly of that extreme. John Calvin had published a daring and abstruse opinion concerning Christ's suffering the pains of the damned in hell; and several divines, at the head of whom was Laud, having attacked this, and other annotations of the Genevan Bible, were reprehended at Oxford by the repetitioner, who relied on the royal countenance in consequence of the attack on Vorstius; but James ordered that students should apply themselves, not to abbreviators, but to the fathers, historians, and controversialists. The scope of his ecclesiastical policy, in fine, was stated to be that of applying Tertullian's maxim to the Reformation: *Id verum quod primum.*

delight in blood : and hence his low estimation in vulgar minds *.

XIX. Violent extremes were the character of this reign : the Puritans railing against the Arminians as Papists ; and the Arminians in power bearing hard on the Puritans.

Lord Clarendon (b. i. p. 88) observes, that Abbot subverted all that had for many years been effected by his predecessor, who had nearly broken the unruly spirit of the non-conformists. He seems, indeed, to have been guided by that mistaken policy, which hopes to conciliate by partial concessions those whose desires were not to be thus stinted. He preferred men if merely silent on the discipline and hierarchy ; and his house was a sanctuary for the most eminent of the factious party †.

Most of the convocations in this reign met *pro forina* : and sitting among the tombs at Westminster Abbey, have been described as *viva cada-vera inter mortuos*.

* 1612. Neale half insinuates, that Prince Henry was poisoned by James, in jealousy of his popular virtues ; and cites Rapin to attest the King's having ordered that no person should appear at court, in mourning. But if this unnatural order was issued, it must have been with the design of preventing an insult from the Puritans, of whom Henry had been the darling, in consequence of his having said, that if ever he should come to the throne, he would endeavour to reconcile them to the church.

† 1613. Abbot, on religious grounds, promoted the marriage betwixt the Princess and the Elector Palatine.

Respecting the amusements in which the clergy may indulge with propriety, opinions have been as various as the dispositions and fancies of men. In the old canons, a difference is made betwixt the *quieta* and the *clamosa*. But to refrain when a thing is doubtful, is perhaps a less fallible rule. Grindall used to play at bowls on a Sunday evening, at Lambeth. Abbot, in 1621, killed a game-keeper, with an arrow from a cross-bow, in buck-hunting. The King dispensed him from trial for the homicide; and a council of bishops acquitted him. An apology also was written for his mischance: but he could not forgive himself. He observed solemnly the day of the accident to the end of his life; and paid an annuity of twenty pounds to the widow. An old law directs a bishop, when dying, to bequeath his pack of hounds to the king's free use.

In the course of this reign died Bishop Rudde, of whom a singular anecdote deserves to be recorded. Having preached a nervous, unadorned discourse before Queen Elizabeth in the decline of her life, he was acquainted by Whitgift, that he had afforded her so much satisfaction, as to merit the reversion of the metropolitan chair. "That is strange," was the reply of Rudde, "for my discourse had not much polish to attract the fancy."—"Her Majesty," said Whitgift, "in her earlier days, was fond of art and eloquence; but she now loves plain matter which touches her heart." It

soon, however, appeared that there are some plain truths, which not even a Magdalen would hear with patience. Rudde, relying on the Queen's new light and partiality, delivered another discourse a little while after, in which he lectured her concerning the duties of old age, when the grinders were few, and they that look out at the windows are darkened. I need hardly subjoin, that he heard no further of his promotion; and preached no more sermons to her Majesty at Whitehall.

1615, In Collier's History, vol. ii. p. 708, a form of prayer used by Bishop King, in consecrating a church, is inserted. It is clothed in the most sublime and flowing language of adoration, and appears to me, to be a masterpiece of human composition; well worthy the attention of all those philosophical Christians, who pretend that places of worship are superstitious and unnecessary. "So Adam had his oratory in paradise; Jacob his praying-place in the fields; Moses his holy ground in the wilderness; and the Israelites their tabernacle in the land of promise. Shall the swallow have a house, and the sparrow her nest; and shall we not find out a residence for thee, O Lord, our Redeemer?"—"Shall we, which are but dust and ashes, build unto ourselves ceiled and beautified houses for our worldly affairs; and shall we not build a temple for thy worship; an audience-court for thy great and fearful name; and repay, as it

were, the tithes of our dwelling-places, unto thee, &c."

SELDEN'S History of Tithes, a violent invective against the clergy, had been the work of many hands; and was a plan of the Puritans to reduce the church to the wretched pittance of Geneva*. It is no wonder that it met with a warm reception from the laity, who gaped after the patrimony of the church. The argument chiefly turns on the nature and extent of Jewish tithes; and of course loses its whole interest and application, where tithes are granted by the statute law of the land. Three divines assumed the weapons of controversy; which they wielded so ably, that Selden was said to have been galled by Tillesly, gagged by Montague, and stung by Nettle. He had, however, a more formidable opponent to encounter, in the court of High Commission. But though, in consequence of its citation, he owned his error at Lambeth, 28th January 1618;—hatred towards the clergy still rankled in his breast. Tillesly, Archdeacon of Rochester, couched his answer to Selden in the three following propositions:—First, that the fathers before the time of Constantine, had held tithes to be due *jure divino*: secondly, that after the ceasing of the Pagan persecutions, tithes were given to the clergy before any imperial laws or canons were enacted to en-

* See Collier, vol. iii. p. 712; Heylin, Hist. Presbyt.

force their payment: and thirdly, that the imperial and ecclesiastical constitutions were only declarative of a divine, not merely introductive of a human right.

XX. Among the acts connected with religion, passed in parliament during the course of the foregoing transactions, were one for inflicting penalties on Popish recusants not repairing to church,—one against Popish burials,—one for observing the fifth of November, and another for enforcing other holidays. The privilege of sanctuary in churches was taken away; penalties for drunkenness were appointed; and forfeitures directed for profaneness in stage-plays.

XXI. Several fathers of sects or denominations among Christians, flourished in the reign of James I. Arminius in Holland, a man of mild temper and excellent character, but much traduced by his enemies, published his Latin Epistles which occasioned the synod of Dort; and has since given name to the Anti-Calvinists. The mystical works sent forth at the same time by Bœhmen in Germany, inflamed, a century afterwards, the imagination of Emanuel Swedenburg. The “Augustinus” of the French bishop Jansenius, created an inward schism in the Catholic church, by generating those Popish Calvinists who are called Jansenists after his name. Nearly at the same period, the younger Socinus, a Polish free-thinker, became father of that daring family of

self-named Christians, who may be said to have denied the Lord that bought them. Bellarmine's Treatise on the Power of the Pope is still esteemed as a standard work among the Catholics: and the Treatise of Grotius on the Evidences of Christianity, is an invaluable treasure to the Christian world at large; a day-spring visiting with beams of light and cheerfulness, the mind that has been overwhelmed in the gloom of infidelity, or perplexed amidst the mists of doubt.

NOTES.

1610.—Several Scotchmen having come into England, with the view of obtaining consecration as bishops, it was objected by Andrews, the Bishop of Ely, that they must first become deacons and priests: to which Spottiswoode represents Bancroft as having replied, that in this case the ordination of presbyters would suffice: but he, in fact, stated that Ambrose and Nestorius were created, the one, Bishop of Milan, the other, Patriarch of Constantinople, without any first order, either of deacon or of priest.—Heylin, Hist. of Dis. p. 382.

On this occasion, Spottiswoode, Hamilton, and Lamb, were consecrated bishops of Glasgow, Galloway, and Brechin;—they were also, at the same time, made Lords of Parliament; but Neale affirms, that they were hated by both ministers and people.

Edward VI. had introduced the Reformation into Jersey and Guernsey; but in the reign of Mary these islands had relapsed into Popery.—Under Elizabeth, a body of Hugonots arriving from France, introduced the discipline of Geneva.—

Although a petition of the inhabitants for making it general, miscarried, they of their own accord discarded the liturgy; while the Puritans dispatched Cartwright and Snape, to establish amongst them the classical discipline.—1576. This measure found connivance from the venal governors, to whom it served as a pretext for secularizing the church-lands, and sweeping into their own coffers the revenues of the deanries. James, deceived by the Puritans, who informed him that his predecessor had granted the petition, indulged these islanders in their beloved discipline for a short time. This boon was granted on his accession in 1603; but in 1623, the office of dean was revived, and the islands were brought back to conformity. In Ireland, likewise, the non-conformists found, in the avaricious lay governors, strenuous friends to their designs against the hierarchy. These obtained the plunder of various cathedrals: which occasioned the throwing together of several impoverished dioceses. As to the parishes, the tithes, having been mostly appropriated to religious houses, had fallen to the crown at the dissolution, under Henry VIII.; and, by conveyance, passed from that monarch to the reforming sharks, his courtiers. The vicarages sunk in their value to nothing; in Connaught, to forty pounds a year; and, the authority of bishops and clergy declining of course, the people followed their fancy in the choice of a religion, and relapsed into Popery. Thus stood matters at the death of Elizabeth. James, at the conference of Hampton Court, proposed sending ministers to the sister island; where he said he was but half a king; this, however, being neglected, Scotch colonists from the opposite coast, settled Calvinism in the province of Ulster. From hence it mingled every where with episcopacy; and the church, under Usher, established the Lambeth articles;—and drew up a form of faith enjoining the strict Sabbath, and inculcating the Calvinistic notion of Christ's descent into hell; while it admitted abstinence from flesh on political, but not on religious considerations; and asserted the possibility of a lawful call without episcopal ordination;

the power of absolution to be declarative simply; and the Pope to be Antichrist.—1615. These articles of the Irish convocation were ratified by the King, in 1615, who seeing equal danger from the Papists and Puritans, leant to the former at one time, and at another to the latter*.

1615. The Bishop of Raphoe and some others, ordaining the Scottish clergy who passed over into Ireland, consented to their abridging the service at their pleasure. This was an irregular proceeding, of which Usher, we are sorry to say, approved. "And thus," adds the historian of the Puritans, "things continued, till Archbishop Laud weakened the Protestants by dividing them, and made way for that enormous growth of Popery, which ended in the massacre of almost all the Protestants in that kingdom." But if the established church had not thus debased itself, by unauthorized mixtures and Calvinistic absurdities, we may ask whether the growth of Popery would have been thus enormous. Mr. Neale is well acquainted with that historical chicanery which fathers upon one cause the effects of another.

Two heretics were burned in 1611; Legate for Arianism, and Wightman for no less than ten heresies. Their obstinacy in error was mistaken by the populace for constancy in supporting the truth; and thus their opinions, though professed in secrecy, gained ground.

1624. This year, in presence of a vast concourse of people, Fisher, a Jesuit, disputed on the doctrines of Popery, with

* Under Usher was drawn up the Irish confession of faith.—This instrument took the English articles as a stock, on which it grafted Calvinism: thus showing that that formulary was not ascounted Calvinistic. Neale, that impartial historian, prints this document, with hands pointing to the Calvinistic parts; but no hand and no italics mark the eleventh section of the first article, which pronounces, by a strange contradiction, that God's fore-ordination offers no violence to the will of reasonable creatures; and that thereby neither the liberty nor the contingency of second causes is taken away; but that they are rather established. To this confession the Puritans appealed, until it was revoked in convocation, in 1634, by the influence of Laud and Strafford.

Laud, Williams, and White, a day each. This contest alone would for ever acquit Laud of the charge of Popery.

Formerly ceremonies were objected to as inconvenient: but in the ABRIDGMENT, published by the Lincolnshire ministers, 1605, the surplice, the cross, and kneeling at the altar, were condemned as SIGNIFICANT ceremonies; as abused by Popery to idolatrous purposes; as burthens at once unreasonable and unlawful, by being more than God imposed; and as hindering edification and causing offence (Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. x. 23—32). This Abridgment was answered by Bishop Moreton, and by Dr. Burgess, a reclaimed non-conformist.

These Brownists affirmed, that as the Catholics worshipped the beast, and Episcopalians the image of the beast, so they who obey the reformed presbytery of pastors, elders, and deacons, worship the shadow of the image. To avoid the severities of Bancroft, many passed into Holland. "And thus stood the brethren of the separation, 1606, when Smith published his book concerning their differences. But afterwards there arose another great dispute, between Ainsworth and Broughton, whether the colour of Aaron's linen ephod were a blue, or a sea-water green: which did not only trouble all the dyers in Amsterdam, but threw their several followers into sides and factions, and made good sport to all the world but themselves alone. By reason of which divisions and subdivisions, they fell into so many fractions, that one of them, in the end, became a church of himself; and not finding any one to join with him in opinion, rushed into the river Ley, and was the minister of his own baptism, whereby he received the name of a se-baptist; which no sectary or heretic had ever obtained before†."

Bradshaw's Treatise on English Puritanism was published in 1605. From the abstract of it given in Neale's first vol. p. 447, it is found to be, in some points, much the same with the Abridgment; but in affirming, that each congregation, being in itself a visible church, cannot be censured by any

† Heylin, Hist. Presbyt. p. 373.

other congregation or church, or spiritual officer, but can only be counselled, it manifests the independent principle; namely, that every congregation ought to choose its own pastors, and that these should bear rule over no other church. The Abridgment and Treatise are deserving of notice, as forming the connecting link between Brownism and Independence. The Treatise, indeed, fraught with the most unaccountable contradictions, professes submission to the hierarchy, and openly denies its power.

It is stated, that if a minister wishes to resign, he lays his reasons before the congregation; and if they should be dissatisfied, he may appeal to the civil magistrate. The pastors of each congregation are the highest spiritual officers; there being no superior pastor except Jesus Christ; much less any diocesan, or provincial pastors, by divine institution. All ignorant, and mere reading priests, were to be rejected; for the congregation ought only to choose such as can interpret and apply the word. In public worship the pastor is to be held the mouth, and the people were only to answer, Amen. The elders are lay assistants of the minister; and to both the power of church censure is committed; and this not for reports, but on account of notorious crimes. They may punish with suspension from the sacrament, and, on the obstinacy of the delinquent, with expulsion from their congregation. If one withdraws, they have no further concern with him. The supreme civil magistrate enjoys power over all the churches in his dominions, and ought to be a member of one of them. The Pope is Antichrist by usurping the supremacy. As bishops, &c. hold their offices *jure humano*, the king may deprive them by virtue of his supremacy. Supremacy is inseparable from the king, even were he an infidel. The king may convoke synods, and therein make laws for the church; and if in these, particular ministers see any thing contrary to the word of God, they are not to resist, but duly to forbear obedience, and to submit to the penalty.

" All ecclesiastical jurisdiction is confined within one con-

gregation: it is purely spiritual, and vested in the ministers and lay elders." Such is the sentiment of the petitioning Puritans, whom Neale represents as not hostile to the church establishment. "We are content," say they, "that the prelates shall enjoy their dignities, only that they shall not be our judges" (vid. Petition). As it was impossible that an episcopal church could embrace the holders of such opinions, dissent became the result; the doctrine was stripped of its absurd compliments to prelacy, and the sect of the Independents was soon after formed.

Prior to this period the term Puritans denoted such as dissented from the hierarchy in regard to church government and ceremonies. It is henceforward to be regarded as signifying, mainly, the opponents of Arminian opinions*.

* It is worthy of remark, that Raynolds always complied with the ceremonies himself; and only urged the propriety of indulging the recusants.

APPENDIX TO THE REIGN OF JAMES I.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE SEVERAL ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS AND EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE.

As it was by order of James I. that the excellent translation of the Scriptures now used in all our churches, was executed, it may not be deemed uninteresting or foreign to our subject, to take, in this place, a review of the various efforts made at different periods of the English history, to place the sacred volume in the hands of the common people. So far was the primitive English church from believing ignorance to be the mother of devotion, that from the earliest periods, whenever any change was effected by time or conquest in the vulgar tongue, new translations of the Scriptures were made, with the intent of keeping pace with each alteration. Adhelme and Egbert, bishops of Sherburne and Lindisfarne, translated the Psalter and Evangelists into the Saxon tongue, about the year 706. In the following century a version of the whole Bible was directed to be made by Alfred the Great; who died when the pious labour was but half completed.—This was pub-

lished in quarto, A. D. 1640, with the Latin interlineary text, by John Spelman.

In Oxford there are three copies of an English translation of the Bible, bearing date A. D. 1290, nearly a century previous to the appearance of Wickliffe's.—Wickliffe translated the Old and New Testaments, A. D. 1380, from the Latin Vulgate into the English of his own times: the Saxon tongue being then not commonly understood, by reason of its admixture with the Norman, introduced at the Conquest.

Though the Scribes and Pharisees, by false interpretations of Scripture, took away the key of knowledge from the Jews, they at no period removed the sacred text itself: an arbitrary measure, reserved only for times, in which conduct more liberal might have been expected. Archbishop Arundel, in the year 1407, restricted the people from the free use of the inspired writings, but more particularly of Wickliffe's translation: and his edict, being disregarded by great numbers, was enforced with various severities.

Tyndal, in the reign of Henry VIII. edited the first printed English translation of the New Testament, at Hamburgh or Antwerp, about the year 1526.—Attempts were made to suppress it: but the art of printing had now secured religion from being injured by the violence of such low resentment. A new edition was published in the following year: but the Popish clergy raising a

violent outcry against its pretended errors, it was destroyed, and the translator himself strangled or burned in Flanders, in 1536.

Coverdale's Bible, being the first edition in English print, of the Old and New Testaments united, was published in folio, in 1535, and in 1550 reprinted in quarto, with wooden cuts.—Matthews's appeared in 1537, being partly Tyndal's and partly Coverdale's, and having the various additions of a kalendar and almanack; of contents, notes, prefaces, and cuts to the Apocalypse.

This translation, revised by Cranmer, with the assistance of several learned ecclesiastics, was reprinted in 1539. Tyndal's prologue and marginal notes were here omitted.

A copy of this authorized Bible having been placed in every church, by order of Cromwell, the vice-regent, the Popish ministers endeavoured to obstruct its utility, by reading it confusedly to their parishioners, "humming and hawing, and hawking" at every word, so that scarce any person could understand them. Nevertheless the volume was received with the greatest avidity. Some contracted their expenses in order to procure it: others prevailed with a neighbour to read it aloud, while they listened; and even old persons, ignorant of the alphabet, learned to read, that they might qualify themselves for enjoying the new pleasure which presented itself. The

demand for the first edition being thus extensive, Grafton, aided by Tonsal and Heath, undertook a second at Paris; leaving out a variety of prefaces and annotations, which had proved offensive to individual reformers; but adding hands and asterisks in the margin, to direct the reader's eye to any passage particularly bearing on the errors of the Church of Rome.—From this translation, published with the royal permission, A. D. 1639, the epistles, gospels, psalms, and hymns, in the liturgy of Edward VI. were taken.—Until the restoration of Charles II. the same arrangement continued; the epistles and gospels were then borrowed from a later translation; but the people having been more familiarly accustomed to the psalter, it was left unaltered, in deference to their prejudices.

After the accession of Edward, in 1548-9, the Bible of 1541 was reprinted: and having a prologue written by the Archbishop prefixed to it, was distinguished by the name of Cranmer's Bible. It was sold to churches at the reasonable prices of ten and twelve shillings; while a penalty was denounced against such as should fail to provide themselves. In 1550, Coverdale's Testament was reprinted, accompanied with the notes of Erasmus.

To the flames which were kindled in the reign of Mary, for the destruction of the Protestant martyrs, all translations of the Bible which lay under

suspicion, were consigned. Such of the reformers as fled to Geneva, published in that city an English translation of the Bible, the first having numerical verses,—and accompanied with notes, chiefly written by Calvin: on account of which it was not suffered to appear in England, till the death of Archbishop Parker; when it came forth in quarto, in 1576, and passed through twenty or thirty editions. Its preface charged the English reformation with an imperfect relinquishment of Popish errors; and several of its marginal notes were seditious.—Under the auspices of Elizabeth appeared the Bishops' Bible; so called from having been undertaken by Archbishop Parker, assisted by several other prelates of great learning. It was published in 1568, illuminated with costly and curious engravings, and delineations of the arms of Cranmer and Parker; while it was rendered useful by its tables of scriptural genealogies, and its maps of Canaan and the apostolic journeyings. To accommodate persons of circumscribed fortunes, a cheaper edition in octavo appeared in the succeeding year. On the larger impression, the Genevan divines could not avoid looking with the jealousy of rivalship. Had they considered, however, that enmity to governors, and the pride of religious peculiarities, are far stronger principles in the human breast than taste, or the love of solid and correct instruction, they might have banished all apprehension of having their own

work superseded by the circulation of its decorated competitor. From the political insinuations, and sarcastic invectives, with which the Genevan comment was artfully interwoven, sumptuous embellishments were an inadequate decoy. Such notes as that on Exodus, xv. 19, which allows disobedience to legitimate authority; that on 2 Chronicles, xix. 16, censuring Asa for leaving his work incomplete, instead of putting his mother to death when he had deposed her; or that on Revelations, ix. 3, wherein the locusts are interpreted as signifying false teachers, monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, doctors, bachelors, and masters; besides numbers of a similar import, equally directed against establishments civil and ecclesiastical, were sought for in vain in the Bishops' Bible: and their absence was deemed but poorly compensated by illustrations addressed to the understanding, or ornaments amusive to the fancy.

In this reign, the Catholics employed a singular sophistry, in decrying the general dispersion of the Scriptures among the laity. Priests, they said, are nurses, who ought to chew the meat, before it is administered to the children: to which the Protestants shrewdly answered, that the meat was so tainted with poison, in passing through the mouths of these nurses, as to render it advisable for the children to make the best of it, without waiting for that previous mastication.

In 1582, the exiled Roman Catholics published the Rhemish Testament; to which the Old Testament was added, at Douay, in 1610;—a work of which the errors were exposed by Fulke and Cartwright.

Among other matters disputed in the Hampton Court conference, the comparative merits of the Bishops' Bible, and that of Geneva, came, as might be expected, under discussion: and the Puritans and conformists railed against each other's translation, with all the jealousy of authorship, and the animosity of religious difference. By their reciprocal invectives, the royal moderator was induced to order the execution of a third translation, to be prepared with such care and labour, that it should supersede the use of both the others; and preclude the necessity of making future alterations in the church version. For the accomplishment of this laudable purpose, he required all the bishops to obtain lists of their learned clergy; for whose preferment he himself took measures. To forty-seven of these, arranged under six divisions, the pious task was committed: and its procedure was marked by so much individual labour, combined wisdom, mutual assistance, and borrowed illustration; by so much attention to accuracy, united with so much respect for the popular prejudices, as to inspire all succeeding generations with the most entire confidence in its authenticity. James furnished the divines with

a body of directions for the prosecution of their undertaking, which were themselves sufficient to refute those calumniators who impeach either his worth or his wisdom. Under his auspices, and admirable provisions, the great labour of love was commenced in the year 1607, and finished with incredible diligence in three years. Scrupulously, and some may think tediously, minute as were the injunctions, the divines, neither coveting praise for expedition, nor fearing reproach for slackness, exceeded them by first examining all the English translations, at the same time with the originals; and then comparing both with Italian, Spanish, French, and Dutch copies.

So exact and so complete was this arduous undertaking found, that, even amidst the subsequent changes in religious sentiments, few attempts were made to alter or improve it. In a pretended parliament, sanctioned by Oliver Cromwell, in 1656, a committee was appointed to revise the translations of the Bible; but its members, after some altercation, separated, having determined that the Bible of King James was the best extant.

Highly then may we consider ourselves indebted to the learned and venerable divines, in the reign of our first James, for having bequeathed to us so rich a legacy;—highly favoured in God's having raised up these wise, assiduous, and accurate

translators, to express in our mother tongue, and in language at once plain and refined, intelligible and sublime, the mysteries of his holy word : and this without any mistake of the slightest importance to salvation ; without any heretical translation, or wilful corruption of the text ; without any expression of the virulence engendered by temporary politics or religious controversy ; and in a form so proper, so correct, so admirable, that, while most other books of the same date are becoming obsolete, and, in consequence of the changes in our language, require glossaries for their interpretation, this is now, after the lapse of two centuries, with a few inconsiderable exceptions, a standard of pure English and of chaste style, which, it is likely, our language being now settled, to continue to the latest generations.

Holy band of glorified worthies ! yours is now the enjoyment of a well-earned felicity, which can derive no heightening from the feeble tribute of human applause. Yet, while the world is occupied in extolling its patriots ; in wondering at its terrible subduers ; in remunerating its statesmen and warriors ;—when statues, tablets, mausoleums are erected ; and public honours liberally, I say not profusely or needlessly conferred, on those who have deserved well, by temporal services, of their country ; perpetual and boundless gratitude forbids us to cease recording your illus-

trious labours, and celebrating your pre-eminent merits; though our empty praises seem poor in your eyes, and be of no benefit or value in your beatified condition.

His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani

Munere.

CHAPTER X.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES I. TO THE BREAKING OUT OF THE CIVIL WAR.

Contents.

- I. *Wisdom of the early Reformers: Observations on Sects.*—II. *State of Parties: Arminians and Calvinists.*—III. *Proceedings against Montague, for his Arminian Book.*—IV. *Encroachments of the Commons.*—V. *The Doctrine of passive Obedience.*—VI. *Policy of the King's Arminian Predilections: Advancement of Laud.*—VII. *Fund for the Establishment of Lectureships.*—VIII. *Temper of the Commons.*—IX. *Laud enforces Ceremonies.*—X. *Removal of Communion-tables; and bowing to them.*—XI. *Puritan Preachers in Oxford.*—XII. *Death of Abbot: Laud Primate.*—XIII. *Laud promotes Juxon, and opposes the Puritans.*—XIV. *Prynne's Histrio-Mastyr.*—XV. *The Libels of Burton and Bastwicke.*—XVI. *Irish, Dutch, and Scotch Churches.*—XVII. *Church-ales.*—XVIII. *The Book of Sports.*—XIX. *New Grounds of Offence: Bishops' Courts.*—XX. *Prosecution of Bishop Williams.*—XXI. *Attempts of Puritans to leave the Kingdom.*—XXII. *Laud opposes Popery.*—XXIII. *Bishop Hall's Treatise on Episcopacy.*—XXIV. *Canons passed in Convocation.*—XXV. *The*

Long Parliament condemns the Canons.—XXVI. Laud impeached.—XXVII. Violence of the Commons, and Progress of Fanaticism.—XXVIII. Root and Branch Petition, &c. and Bill to deprive Bishops of Votes in the House of Lords.—XXIX. Committee of Scandalous Ministers.—XXX. Unjust Charge of Popery levelled at the King.—XXXI. Star Chamber and High Commission Court abolished.—XXXII. Thirteen Bishops impeached on account of the Canons.—XXXIII. The Bishops are assaulted: their Protest: they are deprived of their Votes.—XXXIV. Question—Did the Bishops presume themselves to be a third Estate?—XXXV. The Scots are engaged for the Parliament.—XXXVI. Characters of the opposed Armies.—XXXVII. Their Attendants the Preachers.—XXXVIII. State of the Metropolis.

I. MAN, by some unhappy fatality, as it would appear, in escaping from abuses, and in seeking the improvement of his moral or political condition, is ever apt to transgress the line of real melioration, and to rush into the opposite extreme. The spirit of reform, having once received its propulsion, admits, in few instances, of being regulated or checked by the cold and cautious hand of prudence. Thus, when the Papal authority was abolished in this country, an aversion from the corruptions of the Romish church hurried many well-disposed but intemperate men into a hatred and hostility towards every establishment, which retained even the remotest similitude to that superstition. Correction of abuses with-

out violent or needless innovation was, on the other hand, the golden rule of the early English reformers. In pursuance of this wise maxim, it was not deemed expedient to relinquish the hierarchical government, or many simple and harmless ceremonies incorporated with the Popish worship. When the Puritans then were declaiming against the ceremonies retained, as relics and rags of Popery; and when the Brownists, Presbyterians, and Independents, with united strength, assailed the form of ecclesiastical discipline, as still too nearly assimilated to the abhorred government of Rome, the English church maintained its dignified moderation, unmoved by unreasonable clamours, and deaf to imprudent proposals of further innovation. Experience has amply manifested the wisdom of this conduct. For though the spirit of liberty has raised sects around the church, it still flourishes, and promises to flourish, in a high and palmy respectability. This must doubtless be mainly owing to the excellence of its constitution, which all the arguments of separatists have failed to overthrow or to depreciate. The Methodists, indeed, the only formidable opponents who are ranged against our establishment in the present times, acknowledge it as the true church, and, in many cases, join with it in communion; admitting its inherent excellence, and censuring it only, for its alleged vitiation in doctrine. Its ceremonies and government, once

so formidable a stumbling-block, would to most sects hardly present an obstacle to union.

II. Laud, Bishop of St. David's, who was patronized by Buckingham, prepared, agreeably to the royal instructions, a list of divines, whom he deemed fit to be appointed chaplains to the King; the letter O distinguishing the orthodox, and P the Puritans or Calvinists. He at the same time conferred with Bishop Andrews on the expedience of reviving the quinquarticular controversy in the ensuing convocation: a measure which Andrews earnestly, and it appears successfully, deprecated.

In this reign, religious disputes were blended with political animosities: and an elective attraction seemed to subsist universally, betwixt the terms Calvinist and Whig, as betwixt Arminian and Tory. They who contested with Charles the right of raising money, were for the most part those who clamoured for a change of government in the church, and a Genevan interpretation of the doctrines. Nor can any one wonder at these affinities, who recollects that Presbyterianism is simple and republican in its forms, and was at that time, like civil republicanism, a novelty; while the genius of the hierarchy is allied to monarchy, in its splendour, antiquity, and gradation of power. For similar reasons the aristocracy and church party were combined. The violence of religious parties, thus greatly heightened by contrariety of opinions respecting secular affairs, could not fail

to afford the luxury of secret satisfaction and resentful triumph to the Catholics, the common enemy of all.

III. 1625. Another remarkable feature in the history of the present reign, is the artifice with which the Puritans brought the opposite party into discredit, by invariably coupling the terms Arminianism and Popery. In petitions, acts of parliament, and other documents, in which the anti-arminians took the lead, the one never appears unaccompanied with the other. This was singularly manifested in the first parliament of Charles, wherein the Commons assumed the authority of reprimanding Montague, one of the King's chaplains, for having written a book in favour of Arminianism, in which, as they alleged, an attempt had been made to reconcile the English with the Roman church, and to stretch the royal prerogative beyond the law. They complained at the same time of the increase of Popery, which they attributed to the countenance afforded to priests, and to similar measures of encouragement. As remedies for these abuses, a variety of proposals were stated, to the greater number of which the King signified his assent; promising to disperse able and religious schoolmasters throughout the country, to amend the discipline of the universities; to moderate the evils of non-residence, pluralities, and commendams; to prevent the education of British subjects in foreign seminaries;

to discountenance Popish recusants, and to enforce the statute of Elizabeth, for imposing the penalty of a shilling, on each occasion of absence from divine service in the church. Although the King's subsequent measures evinced his sincerity in pledging himself to the adoption of this general line of conduct, there were several of these promises which the lenience of his temper, and the insatiable demands of his refractory subjects, prevented him from fulfilling to the extent which he had stipulated, or his Commons desired.

1626. In the succeeding parliament, a committee for religion was appointed, in which Pym sat as chairman. On their condemning Montague's book, the King signified his displeasure; conceiving that the right of taking cognizance of such matters belonged exclusively to the royal prerogative. Nor did he fail to order the suppression of the obnoxious volume*.

IV. But whatever concessions this unfortunate prince made to his parliament, whatever disposition he evinced towards accommodating differences, he received no concessions whatever from them in return; they voted him no money; they

* Montague was replied to by several writers; and although three bishops petitioned Buckingham in his behalf, the King seemed inclined to leave him to himself; which occasioned the following remark to be inserted in Laud's Diary: "I seem to see a cloud threatening the church of England: God for his mercie dissipate it."

repaid him no equivalent; every act of the monarch's submission served only to stimulate the Commons to new and endless demands. His jealousy of their encroachments was excited or increased by the chief friends who possessed his ear: by his queen, Henrietta; by Buckingham, whose mother was a Catholic; by Weston, his chief counsellor, and Lord Conway, secretary of state, both rigid Papists. Among these, the principal object of popular dislike was Buckingham; for petitioning for whose removal the parliament was dissolved.

V. With a view to supply the stinted finances of Charles, a general loan was ordered by an act of council: and it was to enforce this measure that several divines were appointed to inculcate from the pulpit, the doctrine of passive obedience. An assize sermon was delivered to this effect, at Northampton, from Ecclesiast. ch. viii. ver. 3 and 4, by Dr. Sibthorpe: but it is bad logic, some writer observes, “to reason from Palestine to England.” Abbot the primate refusing to license this discourse, Laud softened down all its bolder expressions; after which it received the Imprimatur of the Bishop of London, and was published with the title of “Apostolical Obedience *.”

* In assigning a cause for the suspension of Abbot from his jurisdiction, and the putting of his see in commission, the church historians are considerably at variance. While Collier

VI. 1628. It is not, indeed, surprising that Charles should have attached himself to such

attributes it to his refusal to license the Northampton sermon, Heylin, with greater likelihood, pronounces him obnoxious on account of his general partiality to the non-conformists. Fuller alone states that his accidental homicide, in killing the keeper of his deer-park with a cross-bow, afforded a pretext to Laud to visit him in his old age and infirmities, with degradation, in order to fell the falling tree. These different opinions are not irreconcilable: since the first or last may have been the ostensible, and his non-conforming prepossessions the real motive.

This year died Bishop LAUNCELOT ANDREWS, in whose presence, the King, struck with respectful awe, constantly refrained from merriment: such was his skill in languages, as to occasion the remark, that he might have served as interpreter general at Babel. Laud published his sermons after his decease.

While Laud thus sedulously laboured to undermine the Puritans, a conference chiefly hinging on the elect's falling from grace, was held at York house, betwixt some leading members of the Arminian and the Calvinistic parties.—It ended in the usual way; namely, that none returned from the congress, either Arminians or Calvinists, saving those only who had severally entered so. To such attempts at a compromise betwixt parties, neither of whom is disposed to recede one inch from his pretensions, the words of David respecting man have been wittily applied—"There is none that doeth good, no, not one."

1627. In civil differences, where religion is the avowed object, the contending parties are sincere: in wars between states, religion is often no more than a pretext. Thus, while Charles was opposing the Puritans at home, he sent out an armament for the protection of the Hugonots, who may be regarded as the Puritans of France. The expedition to the Isle of Rhé, however, is well known to have been unsuccessful.

friends as Laud, Neale, and Montague, since they were the firm supports of episcopacy, which he wisely considered as the most secure guarantee of his crown. These men were objects of popular detestation, on account of their high Tory principles, both in church and state. But as popular dislike usually amounts to unreasonable prejudice, their enemies raised a report that they were anxious for the restoration of Popery; and that the King, by confiding in them, betrayed a similarity of sentiment: an unfounded calumny, though deriving a semblance of probability from the union with Henrietta, from Laud's scrupulous attention to forms and ceremonies, and from the lenient treatment and smiles of favour which the Popish recusants experienced.

The Commons voted supplies with which the King declared himself satisfied; but as he had refused in return to assent to the petition of right, in the manner which they required and expected, their complaint against his advisers was soon renewed in a charge brought against Dr. Mainwaring, for asserting, in a sermon at Whitehall, that the royal will in imposing taxes was obligatory on the consciences of subjects, on pain of eternal damnation. On proof of this accusation, the Lords determined that the preacher should be fined, imprisoned, and incapacitated from holding any preferment; while they condemned his sermon to be called in and burnt. Charles however,

being inclined to favour a friend, who had suffered for an excess of loyalty, pardoned him at the end of the session, after his submission at the bar of the house, and in a few years promoted him to the vacant bishopric of St. Asaph. Montague, the other *incendiary*, as he is termed by Neale, was installed in the see of Chichester, and Laud removed from St. David's to London. After Buckingham's assassination, this latter prelate was declared prime minister, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs. These promotions have been censured as proofs of the contempt of Charles for the opinions, liberties, and feelings of the people: but his friends have not less right to commend his attachment to servants who continued faithful to him in adversity. And candour ought to remember that no long time elapsed before the primate, Abbot, was restored to his jurisdiction, publicly reconciled at court to the King, and ordered to attend the council-board twice in every week*.

* On entering on his new bishopric, Laud commenced his duties with publishing a new edition of the Thirty-nine Articles, with a view of stifling the predestinarian controversy. It was accompanied by a declaration issued by the King, prohibiting all curious search into the Articles. The Calvinists in a petition complained of restraint in preaching God's free grace in election, and predestination to eternal life. They maintained that the Articles had a general sense; and that any person might put on them what construction he pleased, provided it were agreeable to the analogy of faith: but Mr,

VII. 1629. It has been observed, that, with Roman Catholics, religion consists in praying;

Neale is for no subscription at all: that is, *now* a surplice and *now* a gown; here a liturgy, and there extempore prayer; in the morning, universal redemption; and in the afternoon the reprobation of a part: a variorum edition of the Bible with pulpit notes, by Catholics and Protestants, Calvinists and Arminians, Trinitarians and Socinians, Independents, Methodists, Quakers, &c. &c. &c. Happy, truly happy, were the people that should be in such a case *!

In the following year (1629) we find the committee for religion, with their wonted furiousness of invective, blending Arminianism and Popery together, with the view of casting reproach on the former. Cromwell, at that time a youth of no consideration, accused Neale, the Bishop of Winchester, of giving countenance to Arminian and Popish doctrines; and the Commons, in treating of the Thirty-nine Articles, rejected the interpretation given by Jesuits and Arminians. Though the mere anti-calvinistic nature of the opinions complained of, would have excited the keenest violence of the puritanical body; their being considered as the indications of Tory and high church principles, was perhaps the chief cause of their being assailed so inveterately in parliament. Words are the arbitrary signs and expressions of ideas: and hence their meaning is exceedingly fluctuating, as the ideas attached to them by men in different ages and under different circumstances, are continually varying: nor would it be safe at any time to interpret and define a word, exclusively, from its etymology; since men by tacit compact may give it what sense they will. A pound denotes a very different sum from that which it originally denominated. The term Arminian,

* Let any man read the account of diversities in regard to the Sacrament, detailed in Strype's Life of Parker, p. 152, and he will there perceive the charms of uniformity.

and with Puritans, in preaching. At this time there were in England 9284 livings, of which 3845 were either appropriated to cathedrals and colleges, or impropriated in lay hands. A large subscription was raised, and vested in feoffees, for buying these up for the benefit of the clergy. At first the feoffees proceeded hopefully, recovering only the lay impropriations, which they obtained at twelve years' purchase. But Laud soon became jealous of their patronage and suspicious of their design: and, indeed, he well might; for they were a club of non-conformists, who, instead of applying the impropriations they procured to enrich the poor livings to which they belonged, divided their revenues into salaries of 40*l.* and 50*l.* for the support of lectureships in market-towns, where novelty is peculiarly in request, as such places are usually distinguished by an excess of leisure without a proper counterbalance of knowledge. To these si-

in the reign of Charles, expressed an advocate of passive obedience, and a high-churchman, as well as an anti-calvinistic interpreter of the Articles; while Puritans were regarded, not merely as serious characters, but as the enemies of ceremonies and of the hierarchy; the believers in Calvinistic decrees, and those who panted after an undefined and an extravagant civil liberty. These characters, it is true, were frequently found in combination; yet Calvinists were not wanting, who were warmly attached to the discipline of the established church; nor Arminians, friends of civil and religious liberty. As to the alleged conjunction of Arminianism and Popery, it was, in every instance, and especially in those of Charles and Laud, an odious and baseless slander.

tuations non-conformists only were preferred; who would naturally in each parish excite a prejudice against the regular clergy, if (however generally worthy and zealous) at all differing from them in doctrinal opinions. It was the worst feature in this system of puritanical patronage, that the lecturers were entirely dependent on the feoffees; being liable to removal annually, if they afforded the slightest displeasure. When this was represented to Charles, he wisely replied, "It is an abuse; I will not have the clergy fettered with lay dependencies." Laud, too, wrote in his Diary, and not without reason, that this establishment was the main instrument of the Puritans in their design to undo the church. A prosecution was accordingly instituted against the feoffees; but as they were found to have acted honourably, and to be considerably out of pocket, it was dropped through apprehension of popular odium. In 1632, only thirteen impropriations had been bought up for 5000*l.* or 6000*l.*: the confederacy was then broken, and the capital, we are sorry to add, very dishonourably confiscated to the royal use. For this alienation necessity itself could hardly supply a plea.

That Charles and Laud entertained a jealousy against all lecturers, appeared further in the instructions given this year to the bishops; and with what justice, the character given of these declaimers by their advocate Neale, will, perhaps, sufficiently evince. "They were chiefly Puritans,

who, not satisfied with full conformity, so as to undertake a regular cure of souls, preached in the afternoon, being chosen by the people. They were strict Calvinists, hostile to ceremonies, &c."*

It further appears, that the lectureships were of three descriptions; and it is difficult to determine which was the most objectionable. The first were those superinduced into another minister's cure, who would wean from their regular pastor the affections of his people; the second were termed com-

* As a specimen of the devotions, instructions, and general spirit of these lecturers, we find one of them, Bernard, praying, in St. Sepulchre's, London, that the eyes of the Queen might be opened to see Christ, whom she had wounded by her infidelity, superstition, and idolatry†. Chauncey declared that there was much Atheism and Popery, Arminianism and heresy, crept into the church; and Smart inveighed against pictures from the text, "I hate those that love superstitious vanities." One preacher affirmed that the Gospel stood on tip-toe, and was departing to New England; and another, that the night was certainly approaching, since the shadows were longer than the substance, and ceremonies more in force than godliness. Some had preached against windows of stained glass in churches, and others, by a gross outrage, had broken them with staves. From the whole body of gifted speakers, the regular clergy, who confined themselves to the Liturgy and homilies, were honoured with the title of Dumb-dogs. Such were their indecencies, in short, that Neale himself, their historian, or rather their advocate, is compelled to give them up, by acknowledging the zeal of some to have been indiscreet. Such a concession from such a writer, speaks much more than the literal meaning of the words.

† Hume, Charles I.

ination lectureships, from an agreement among certain ministers to preach in a market-town; producing the same effect with the former, and inspiring a passion for endless novelty: while the insignificant title of running lectures was given to the last, in allusion to the compact among the hearers to assemble at a particular church, and after service to meet at the house of one of the party, where they explained and discussed the sermon, with other theological topics; and after running out in an abuse of the doctrine and discipline of the church, appointed another parish for the next meeting. The running lecture sometimes, also, referred to the preacher, who made the tour of a district, diving like a sea-bird, and reappearing in a different place, but announcing from each pulpit, where he was next to be found. We cannot be surprised that such preaching-mad irregularities should awaken the vigilance, and excite the suspicion, of those who presided over the church. Yet it must be owned, that several of the bishops carried their opposition to unwarrantable lengths; permitting no sermon whatever to be preached on Sunday afternoons, and suppressing, in some places, even explanations of the Catechism *.

* In the preceding paragraph some facts are mentioned in advance. "This year," says Fuller, "was distinguished by a controversy betwixt Nicholas Smith, a regular, and Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon; the hammer of one smith clashing against another." Thus the Catholics were not more in harmony than the Protestants.

VIII. 1630. In parliament, the Commons were, as usual, much more inclined to discuss theological points, and to present accusations against the existing state of religion, than to fulfil the purpose of their being called together, by making grants of money to the Crown. Such being their temper, the King speedily dissolved them, and imprisoned several of their leading members: resolving, that, since his parliament only clogged the wheels of government, when convened for the purpose of supplying them with oil, he would conduct the machine, so long as should be practicable, independently of such pretended assistance.

IX. As the venerable ceremonies, approved of by the early reformers, were now treated with general disrespect, Laud determined, not only to retain them, but to draw a stronger line between the church and the complainants, by introducing every where scriptural paintings, as altar-pieces, and increasing the solemnity of public worship. Hence discontent obtained a new ground of querulousness; and the suspicious deemed themselves amply justified in their belief, that Popery was about to be reintroduced. That this surmise was unjust, with reference to Laud, appears from his having replied to the offer of a cardinal's hat, at this time made to him by the Pope, that "something dwelt within him which would not suffer his compliance, till Rome should be different

from what it then was." Nevertheless, because he demanded a respect for the sacerdotal character, exacted obedience to the dictates of early councils, and considered ceremonies as useful in promoting devotion, the most sarcastic reflections were cast upon him by his enemies. A daughter of the Earl of Devonshire having embraced the Catholic faith, and being interrogated by Laud as to the reason of her apostacy, replied, that she was unwilling to travel in a crowd; and since his lordship and others were plainly journeying to Rome, she had, for the sake of convenience, only set out a little before them. Altar-pieces were termed paintings over the face of the old whore of Babylon; and Laud obtained the name of Master of Ceremonies. His scrupulous attention in these matters was ridiculous enough; as appears from the pompous re-opening of the church of St. Catherine Cree, in London, which Hume and Neale have minutely described. Some regard, however, to the internal decoration of churches was requisite, as the negligence of Abbot had suffered many to fall out of repair, and even to be grossly profaned.

X. Amongst other regulations respecting ceremonies, Laud directed the removal of communion-tables from the middle of each church to the eastern end of the chancel, where they were led to by a step or two of ascent, and stood surround-

ed with a railing. When it is remembered that the Puritans were warm admirers of the Presbyterian forms, by which ceremonies were altogether exploded, and the blessed sacrament received in the familiar attitude in which people dine and sup, candour will, perhaps, indulge the zealous fears of the prelate, lest the most important and solemn of all ordinances should be profaned; and lest, by making any concessions to the religious malcontents, he should occasion the downfall of the whole ecclesiastical establishment.

Trivial, however, as this substitution may appear, it excited the most violent ferment throughout the country: and a few years afterwards, when it was more generally insisted on, books were written in condemnation and defence of it, with all the animosity which would distinguish a controversy on the most important doctrine of religion. The table, as it now stood, was termed an altar: and as the minister who officiated retained the name of priest, the ordinance was conceived to imply the sacrifice of the mass. Laud, however, replied to these calumnies, that his intention was to effect the more reverend conducting of the service, by some distinction between a common table, and that of the Lord. The ascent on which the priest stood gave honour to whom honour is due; and placed the people in a more convenient posture for hearing his words and receiving the

elements. The removal of the table would accommodate the congregation with ampler space in the body of the church; and to surround it with a railing, was to fence it from common business and profanation. It was further meet for the uniformity of discipline, that the parish-churches should imitate the custom, which had ever prevailed in all the old cathedrals *.

Another custom introduced at the same time by Laud, was that of bowing to the altar on entering and leaving the church. This, too, was conceived to refer to the real presence; but Bishop Morton observed, that, as we are accustomed to bow even when the eucharist is not present, it is to the Lord of the table, and not the table of the Lord, that we pay our decent reverence. The altar of Canterbury was furnished and consecrated

* Bishop Williams, in his book, entitled, *The Holy Table, Name and Thing*, stood forth as the chief opponent of this measure. He was answered in a learned treatise by Dr. Heylin. Lord Clarendon allows that "Laud prosecuted this affair more passionately than was fit for the season; and had prejudice against those, who out of fear or foresight, or not understanding the thing, had not the same warmth to promote it: so that, from that unimportant subject, proceeded a schism among the bishops themselves, and a great deal of uncharitableness in the learned and moderate clergy, to one another." On the other hand, however, the treatment of the Puritans on this occasion, led them into highly intemperate conduct towards the establishment. See Hacket's *Life of Williams*.

after a model given by Bishop Andrews, in a manner unquestionably too Romish*.

These changes occasioned much animosity. Some considered gestures as the suburbs of superstition; others thought that "the moiety of man, yea, all of him that is visible, should not be exempted from God's service, unless a writ of ease could be produced from Scripture." Both parties, in a word, sacrificed their mutual charity on the altar in disputing where it should stand.

Some time afterwards a few alterations were made in the Liturgy, which, trifling as they were, fomented the discontents, and increased the clamours of the Puritans. The passage, "In the name of Jesus every knee should bow," had been now translated, "AT the name of Jesus"—a change complained of as part of the Popish system. Laud maintained, in his general answer to the objectors, that AT the name of Jesus was no innovation, since it was found in the liturgy of Geneva, printed in 1567. He added, that bowing to the altar

* Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, was at this time brought into trouble for preaching the doctrine of predestination; not that his opinions were deemed objectionable, but that the King had forbidden such questions to be touched at all. Davenant had declared for universal redemption at Dort; and the cognizance taken of his sermon, shows the impartiality as well as the prudence of the King and Laud, in wishing neither Calvinists nor Arminians to discuss so delicate a question before the people.

could not be idolatrous, since neither Elizabeth nor James had forbidden it; and since the action might be justified from Psalm xcv. 6: that only ignorance could imagine the removal of communion-tables to the east end of the church, where Elizabeth intended they should stand, as savouring at all of Popery; and that he had no intention to alter the forms of the church, but desired to bring it back to its standard at the first reformation. Although an advocate for the divine right of bishops, he acknowledged their subjection to the regal power; and stated that the late changes in the collects and prayers had been made under the sanction of the King himself, who had only fettered the prelates with a proviso, that nothing should be innovated contrary to church doctrine and discipline.

XI. 1631. In Oxford, some Puritan preachers, who obtained access to the university pulpit, attacked the established order of things, from the texts, Numb. xiv. 4, "Let us make a captain, and return into Egypt;" and 1 Kings, xii. 2, &c. By the influence of Laud, at that time chancellor, these dealers in Egyptian wisdom were expelled.

If this measure excited the disgust of their party, they took still further offence at the subscription which Laud established for repairing and rebuilding St. Paul's; seeing Popish superstition even in an ornament to the metropolis.

XII. 1633. But the non-conformists had most

reason for boding ill to their cause, in consequence of the promotion of Laud to the primacy, left vacant by the death of Abbot. This latter prelate has been extolled by Puritan writers as pious, learned, hospitable, and moderate: but Lord Clarendon pronounces him to have been morose, Calvinistic, ignorant of the interests of the church, and only religious in reviling Popery. The truth lies between these two extremes of prejudice. Abbot was unquestionably too remiss in his exaction of conformity to the articles and canons. To indulge irregularities affords a show of a liberal mind: but where does such latitude reach its determinate limit? If two doctrines, two modes of worship, are permitted, wherefore not two hundred? A church must necessarily possess the external sign of a church: uniformity in religious observances. Destitute of this, it is a medley of discordant ingredients, to which it were ridiculous to apply any term indicating unity. Abbot secretly favoured the malcontents, who, coming to him by candlelight, received the name of Nicodemites*.

XIII. No sooner was Laud enthroned on the metropolitan chair, than he set himself to correct the grand error of his predecessor, a want of due regard for the church as an establishment. "He meant," says Lord Clarendon, "that the discipline of the church should be felt as well as spoken of; and was called a Papist only from his enmity

to Calvin." He resolved to support the hierarchy, which he saw endangered by external assaults, and either betrayed or carelessly defended by the Puritans beneath the shadow of its protection. With this view, he at once discharged an office of private friendship, and performed an essential service to the church, in promoting to the see of London, Juxon, his fellow-collegian, a man of sound understanding, upright principles, and mild disposition, but obnoxious to the Puritans as being fond of profane field-sports. As the Puritan lecturers swarmed throughout the kingdom, and as many of the gentry entertained irregular chaplains, who in their private performance of the English service, violated the discipline of the church : to remove these grievances, it was now directed, that the canons relating to ordination should be strictly enforced. These provided that no person should be admitted to holy orders, without a title afforded by a benefice or curacy, except when ordained upon his fellowship; or living at his own charges in either university; or a master of arts of five years' standing; or unless the ordaining bishop undertook to provide for him. These regulations have ever since been found beneficial, in preventing the influx of reverend loungers and cassocked rambles into the church; in securing for the inferior clergy an adequate maintenance; and in subjecting to the bishop's cognizance each minister within his diocese,

the best pledge for uniformity and regularity in the public service *.

XIV. It was Laud's attachment to the discipline of the church, which occasioned the severities inflicted on Prynne; for though, when indicted in the Star-chamber for his *Histrio-mastyx*, in which plays, music, dancing, festivals, and Christmas merry-makings were condemned, he was accused as a libeller of the King and Queen, who were attached to such diversions; his chief offence was that of interspersing these invectives with an abuse of the hierarchy, the ceremonies, the innovations in religious worship, and, chiefly, "the bellowing of a tenor like oxen, the barking of a counterpoint like a dog-kennel, and the grunting of bass like hogs." After the Earl of Dorset had reviled him as "*omnium malorum nequissimus*," he was condemned to stand in the pillory, and to be imprisoned during life. It was as champion of the Puritans that he experienced so hard a sentence, which only excited him to new provocations. In 1637, for a fresh libel, entitled, "*The News from Ipswich*," in which he termed the Archbishop, arch-agent for the devil, and the other prelates, Luciferian Lord Bishops, he at length met with a severer punishment, having

* In the different reports made by Laud, concerning the state of his province, the prevalence of lecturers, and the miserable subsistence of poor vicars, were constant subjects of complaint.

the remainder of his ears sawed off at Westminster, and being branded on the cheeks with the letters S. L. to signify, slanderous libeller *.

XV. About the same time, a similar punishment was inflicted on two other Puritans, Burton, a divine, and Bastwicke, a physician. Burton had rather taken "a snap than a meal" of learning; and was soured by disappointment in his hopes of becoming clerk of the closet. He was rector of St. Matthew's, Friday Street, in London, where his sermon, the libel, was ingeniously tortured from the text, "My Son, fear thou the Lord and the King; and meddle not with them that are given to change." Lord Clarendon terms Bastwicke, a half-witted, crack-brained fellow, alike unknown to the universities, and to the college of physicians. His book was entitled, *Flagellum Pontificis*; but, being written in Latin, its abuse was not so wide-spreading, as if, like Rabshakeh, he had railed in the vulgar tongue. These incorrigible men, with inveterate malice, uttered inflammatory speeches during their punishment. Together with Prynne they were severally banished to the islands of Scilly, Jersey, and Guernsey, where they continued in disgrace till liberated by the Long Parliament.

* On Prynne's return to the Tower by water, he composed the following distich, in allusion to his brand:

Stigmata maxillis referens, insignia LAUDIS
Exultans remeo, victima grata Deo.

XVI. 1634. That general uniformity is desirable in a church, was the pole-star of Laud's policy. In the convocation of Dublin, held in the year 1615, a body of strongly Calvinistic articles, drawn up by Archbishop Usher for the church of Ireland, had been stamped with the approbation of the bishops and clergy; but they were at this time superseded by the Thirty-nine Articles sent from England, which still regulate the faith of the united churches*. Uniformity was also pressed upon the Dutch church in London: but the attempt to impose the English Liturgy on Scotland, in the year 1638, produced a renewal of the celebrated covenant, which led, among other disasters, to the abolition of episcopacy as the established religion in that part of the realm†.

XVII. The profanation of the Sabbath, in the western circuit, by revels, church-ales, bid-ales, and clerk-ales, having been complained of as a nuisance and offence to two of the judges, they

* Laud this year had prompted the King to restore to Ireland the impropriations which belonged to the Crown. Possibly, this measure may have contributed to bring about the acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles.

† To enlarge on these subjects belongs not to our plan. Fuller was afraid lest his fingers should be frost-bitten, in writing of that cold country.

As the war with Scotland was not unaptly termed, a *Bellum episcopale*, the sum of three shillings and ten pence in the pound was contributed by the clergy towards its support, according to the valuations of their livings in the king's book.

issued an order for the suppression of these scenes of riot, and occasions of seduction; directing that it should be published, three Sundays in each year, by all the parish ministers, several of whom were punished for disobedience to the mandate. For this arrogant assumption of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, these judges were summoned before the council, where they alleged, in their defence, the unanimous request of the justices, strengthened by several precedents in the late and present reigns. Their pretences, however, proved of no avail: they received a severe reprimand, and were directed to rescind their order at the next assizes.

In the mean time, many of the clergy in Bath and Wells, having been consulted, delivered their opinion in favour of these festivities; as drawing friends together, reconciling enemies, and refreshing the labouring poor. The churches were always fullest on these occasions. Revel-days were the feast of the dedication, and, happening on the Sabbath before or after the day of the saint, prevented tippling on the week-days. The church-ales were pastimes after the service, which introduced benevolence of much use to the church: the clerk-ales were attended with charitable subscriptions for the maintenance of the parish-clerk; and the bid-ales, for re-establishing the fortunes of a poor decayed labourer or tradesman, by the alms of a Sunday feast.

XVIII. In consequence of these representations

Laud persuaded Charles to revive the proclamation of 1618, for encouraging recreations on the Lord's Day, provided the people had first presented their duty to God, and continued in obedience to the laws *. Man, in his lapsed condition, requires a curb, rather than a loose rein: hence a censure must again be passed on the Book of Sports, since, to lead to the extreme border of indulgence, is to provoke transgression of the line. A small portion of the evening in the labourer's Sabbath, might innocently be withdrawn from purposes purely religious; and the Puritans may have prescribed an extravagant and unreasonable austerity; but the pernicious consequence of the proclamation of sports was not to encourage a grave and calm relaxation, but to stamp with the sanction of legitimate authority, the balls, masquerades, and private theatricals of the court; and the riots, morrice-dances, May-games, cudgellings, wrestlings,

* White, bishop of Ely, and Dr. Heylin, wrote treatises in defence of the Book of Sports; but even Collier justly thinks that they admitted of too much liberty.

As several battles in the civil wars were afterwards fought on the Lord's Day, many deemed the losses sustained by the King a punishment for the Book of Sports. To this it was replied, that, "as every day in the week is be-rubricked with English blood, some must needs fall on Sunday." But excessive strictness is as likely to transgress the bounds of reason as immoderate indulgence. The Transcendants afterwards observed the Sabbath without any peculiar solemnity, by pretending to keep every day alike.

and wakes * of a licentious peasantry. To provide that this declaration should be published in the parish-churches, was a task imposed upon the bishops; and the seven following years exhibited a series of suspensions and deprivations in the High Commission Court, sustained by many pious and conscientious clergymen, whose minds revolted, as they well might, at the idea of being thus compelled to sanctify profanation, and to blow aloud the trumpet of riot and intemperance †.

XIX. In the existing irritation of the public mind, the slightest grievances were aggravated into serious injuries. The Archbishop, in his attachment to the ecclesiastical order, highly offended the lawyers, by drawing into the spiritual courts much of the business of Westminster Hall; as well as by obtaining from the King an order, that one half of the Masters in Chancery should be civilians. Unpopularity was likewise incurred, though with less reason, by permission given to the bishops to

* "Wakes, or watchings; but somewhat different," says Fuller, "from the watching taught and practised by our Lord."

† Some ministers threw the reading of the proclamation on their curates; and many read the fourth commandment immediately after it. But if the Puritans erred on the side of strictness, their adversaries were undoubtedly too remiss. "A rage against Popery," says the civil historian of England, "and devoting the festival of the Sabbath to the most melancholy indolence—(indolence! is it not a day of rest from labour?)—was the characteristic and symbol of the puritanical party."

hold courts, in their own names, and with their own seals; and to administer an oath of inquiry to churchwardens. Other causes of complaint were, the appointment of Laud to the civil office of commissioner of the revenue, and of Juxon to that of lord treasurer; but, above all, the lenity shown to Papists, whom the bigotry of the Puritans would fain have not indulged in the quiet and unoffending enjoyment of their religion *.

XX. 1637. Bishop Williams, to whom a grudge was still due in consequence of his recent opposition to the removal of communion-tables, was prosecuted afresh in the Star-chamber on an old charge of showing a libellous letter which had been addressed to him by Osbaldeston, the master of Westminster school. Kilvart, a proctor in the Commons, the Bishop's present accuser, perceiving

* 1635. A subscription having been proposed for the banished ministers of the Palatinate, Laud started two objections to the letters patent: first, that they termed the religion of these ministers the same as ours, whereas they were sublap-sarians; and secondly, that the church of Rome was pronounced to be an anti-christian yoke; but, if so, where are our orders? The King assented to the validity of these scruples: the words were altered, and Laud promoted the collection.

1636. Several of the bishops, in the year following, published their primary articles of visitation. Those of Wren, of Norwich, comprised 897 questions, addressed to churchwardens, and bearing chiefly on the Puritans. Neale pronounces some of them to have been insignificant, some superstitious, and some impossible to be answered; but, as usual, he subjoins but a sorry proof of his assertion.

the defence to rest on the testimony of a man named Pridgeon, contrived to lay a natural child to his charge. Williams, however, by means of two evidences, transferred the bantling to one Boone; upon which Kilvart changed the ground of accusation, and prosecuted the Bishop for suborning witnesses. Suspecting his judges to be unfriendly, he now attempted to compound with the crown for immunity: but his overture being construed as an evidence of his guilt, he was fined in 8000*l.* suspended, and imprisoned*.

XXI. As the Puritan chaplains entertained in the houses of noblemen, obstructed Laud's measures by the publication of pamphlets, the liberty of the press was restrained by an order that no

* "This sentence," says Warburton (*Remarks on Neale's History*), "evinces Laud's badness of heart;—his support of arbitrary power may have proceeded from gratitude to his master; and his enmity to the Puritans, from his high-church principles; but the severities inflicted on Williams, originated solely in envy and revenge." This remark will appear still more just, when we consider that the sufferer had been the adviser of Laud's promotion; that the ground of accusation had been altered through its untenableness; that menaces and other low arts were resorted to; and that the servants of Williams had been bribed, by mild treatment, to Kilvart's pleasure. A fine of 10,000*l.* was imposed on Osbaldeston;—half for the King, and half for Laud; who had conceived themselves alluded to as the "leviathan and the urchin." This man was restored to his places by the Long Parliament:—but in joining the party of the King, when that body infringed the constitution, he manifested a principle of integrity.

book should be published, without an imprimatur, obtained from the Primate or Bishop of London in the metropolis, and from the Chancellor in either university. It was this new stretch of power, succeeding the recent prosecutions, which impelled the Puritan laity to withdraw to New England, that they might escape the reach of ecclesiastical authority. Haselrig, Pym, Hampden, and Cromwell, had, among others, actually embarked; when a proclamation issued from the Star-chamber, directed, that no layman should be permitted to depart from the kingdom, unless furnished with a license from the commissioner of plantations, and a testimonial of his conformity signed by his parish-minister; and no minister without testimonials from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Of this ill-advised detention, so opposite to the Spartan principle of making a bridge for a flying foe, the court had speedily too much reason to repent. It would be curious to speculate upon the probable result to England, had this company been suffered to take a quiet departure. In this manner prevented from crossing the Atlantic, some of the malcontents passed over into Holland, where, they observed, the sun shone equally bright, and the Sun of righteousness was far brighter*.

* It appears from Laud's Diary, that at this time he was fully aware of the inflammation of the public mind. He mentions several libels which had come to his knowledge:

XXII. 1638.—While thus sedulously employed in opposing the non-conformists, Laud afforded fresh proofs of his enmity to Popery, by procuring a proclamation for calling in a Catholic work, entitled Sale's Introduction to a devout Life; and by republishing his celebrated controversy with Fisher; which extorted from Sir Edward Deering, his enemy, the compliment,—“He has muzzled this Jesuit; and will strike the Papists under the fifth rib, after he shall have been dead and gone: and then, wherever his body shall be buried, Paul's will be his monument, and his book his epitaph.”

XXIII. 1639. Directing his chief jealousy, however, against the Scotch covenanters and English Puritans, the Archbishop was mainly anxious for the diffusion of the Liturgy; which was translated into Greek and French for the use of the island of Jersey. As the Scots had now publicly abolished the hierarchy, which their de-

one of which stated that the devil had left him possessor of St. Paul's; another placed his speech on the condemnation of Williams, in the pillory; and a third represented the church of England by a candle, expiring in the socket, and going out in a snuff. Yet none of these things moved him.

Among the refugee Puritans was one Rogers, of Dedham; “an awakening preacher,” said Bishop Brownrigge, “whose wild notes did more good than our set music.”—“That is,” adds Warburton, “a mad fanatic, who will always draw the people after him: we have now many such bullfinches, and their notes are as wild as ever.”

cree had branded as unlawful; to balance this declaration, Laud prevailed on Bishop Hall to write his treatise on the divine right of episcopacy. In the first draught, Hall chiefly confined himself to its lawfulness; while he attacked Presbyterianism as not being the primitive form: but the Archbishop, with prompt sagacity, perceived the advantage to which the adversaries would turn this petition for the sufferance of the hierarchy; and on that account suggested a variety of amendments, the greater number of which were adopted by the author: but even to the improved copy, it was objected that the question, whether episcopacy were a distinct order, or only a degree, was waved; that the Pope, a Christian bishop, was termed Anti-christ; and that the sabbatarian rigours were not sufficiently condemned. The passages complained of were accordingly expunged or softened, and the book thus cooked up, at length made its appearance*.

* Cyprian Anglic. p. 460.—After the ample consideration bestowed on this question, in the essay prefixed to the present volume, it were tedious to offer a complete analysis of Hall's treatise. Several of its leading features may nevertheless be pointed out, principally with a view to show Laud's acuteness of remark†.

† Neale, with his wonted effrontery, asserts that this work was altered by Laud, contrary to Hall's inclinations; but he omits to tell us why Hall acquiesced in these alterations, which were proposed only in the form of suggestions.

This work was answered by several Presbyterian divines, whose initials joined, formed the signature *Smectymnus*: under which name a contro-

XXIV. 1640. The Parliament, as usual, postponed the supply demanded for carrying on the

The dissertation first states that episcopacy is lawful, ancient, and divine; and cannot be overthrown; where already established, without a violation of God's holy ordinance. On this passage Laud observed, that it would be more correct and definite, to term episcopacy, simply, a divine institution: he also disliked the words, "where already established;" for, since episcopacy had at first been EVERY WHERE established, the phrase wanted compass. And whereas the author of the tract had affirmed that episcopacy signified imparity and superiority of jurisdiction; "Henderson's chair at Glasgow," said Laud, "is higher than

versy was carried on with Bishop Hall, on the apostolical institution of episcopacy, and on the antiquity of liturgies in the church. On the first question, the prelate has clearly the advantage over them, in their idea of bishops as presidents or chairmen of presbyters, in the three first centuries.—This question was referred to foreign divines, in Holland, Geneva, France, &c.; but they either were silent, or returned answers favourable to episcopacy.—Smectymnuus attempted to show that liturgies cannot be proved to have been generally used before the springing up of the Arian and Pelagian heresies. Hall however replied, that the passages they quoted from the fathers, may have referred to private prayer as unpremeditated; and on this occasion he introduces the following beautiful passage: "Far be it from me to pour water on the fervours of the Spirit, which I would rather feed with oil. No; let the full soul pour itself out in gracious expressions of its holy thoughts into the bosom of the Almighty. Let both the sudden flashes of our quick ejaculations, and the constant flames of our more fixed conceptions, mount up from the altar of a zealous heart unto the throne of grace. And if there be some stops or solecisms in the present utterance of our private wants, they are so far from being offensive, that they are the most pleasing music in the ears of God. Let them be broken off with sobs and sighs, and incongruities of delivery; our God is no otherways affected to this imperfect elocution, than an indulgent parent, towards the clipped and broken language of his dear child, which is more affecting to him, than any other smooth oratory. This is not to be opposed in another by any man that hath found the true operation of this grace in himself."

war against the rebel Covenanters, and began with appointing committees of religion and grievances ;

the rest ; but episcopacy is more than this : it is a distinction of order. The superiority of a bishop is an intrinsic power in his character, not conferred by canon law, or by the will of a prince, but possessed by virtue of his consecration." Hall next laid down the common position, that Presbyterianism has no foundation, as the church of Christ, either in Scripture or in the practice of fifteen hundred years. That which the Apostles recommended, though without command, is an apostolical institution : apostolical institution is divine right ; and a government, established by the Apostles, was intended for a perpetual duration. The universal practice of the church in the age succeeding that of the Apostles, affords the best comment on the apostolic practice and writings. The primitive fathers would not readily change the form of government received from them. With these statements Laud expressed himself dissatisfied. Episcopacy, said he, must be allowed a higher ascent than the Apostles. Rome is to be guarded against as well as Geneva. The *jus divinum immediatum* is the foundation of independence in the order : the preference of one was a matter of compact : the *jus divinum mediatum*, or a church aristocratical originating in the Apostles and not in Christ, is the Italian rock. Some of the Genevans, on the other hand, allow a *jus divinum, suadens sed non imperans* : and Beza, *imperans sed non universaliter imperans, et citra considerationem durationis* : so that the churches of Geneva and Scotland might have bishops at one time and not at another. This is the rock in the Lake of Geneva.—To return to Bishop Hall : Men condemned, says he, as heretics, by the ancient church, are not the best vouchers for church government. Texts on which a new government is founded, ought to be clear and indisputable in meaning. New and unheard-of tenets ought to be suspected : and to re-

for which refractory behaviour they were suddenly dissolved. The monarch's necessities were better supplied by the convocation, who, in consideration of a commission lately granted, authorizing them to amend the canons and to enact new ones, voted him six subsidies to be paid in six years, at the rate of four shillings in the pound.

Laud, who was directed by a clause in the commission to be a party to every consultation, introduced canons against Popery and Socinianism; and by his influence the penalties inflicted on popish

volt from the Apostles to Calvin is a bold measure. If the Presbyterian government were the true church of Christ, men would have been agreed long before on the form and condition of that institution. If this be the kingdom of God, as the Papists and Puritans pretend, then is not Christ's kingdom set up in the church. "Beware here," said Laud, "of a saucy answer: which these people are much more ready to give, than a learned one."—The accession of privileges and titles affects not the episcopal function. This refers, observed the corrector, to archbishops, patriarchs, &c. but the meaning requires being guarded.—Christian polity requires nothing absurd or impossible; and presbyterianism may be useful, where episcopacy is not to be had. A dangerous concession, remarked the Archbishop: episcopacy is every where practicable; the Presbyterians obtrude their discipline as Christ's kingdom and ordinance, and discard episcopacy as unwarrantable. Let us not disguise the truth or mince the matter, through complaisance to Amsterdam or Geneva.

It was Laud's custom to collect from his bishops, an account of their several dioceses; and to present an annual report of the whole province to the king. This year, the last of these reports was published.

recusants for absence from their parish-church, were extended to all separatists.

As the commission to enact canons had only extended to the close of the parliamentary session, the King issued a new grant for continuing the assembly as a synod; and they sat, passing constitutions, a full month after the Parliament had been dispersed. In this assembly, which Fuller, the church historian, attended, and concerning which he speaks in the first person plural, "We met, &c." seventeen canons were enacted on miscellaneous subjects: on the divine right of kings; on ceremonies; on preaching licenses, and institution, as exclusively to be granted by bishops; on penance and excommunication; on wills and citations. Articles of visitation were drawn up and registered in a book, and inquiries were directed to be confined to them. An attempt was made to introduce an oath of adherence to the doctrine, discipline, and government of the English church, to be imposed on all divines and members of universities; but as it was found to be obnoxious to a considerable body of the clergy, the King dispensed with it for the present.

In the canon against Socinianism, Socinians, says Neale, are not once mentioned: but this is a mere carping remark. There is a slight grammatical inaccuracy in the sentence; but the word "they" refers very clearly to the professors of the Socinian heresy.

As to the &c. in the midst of an oath, which has been treated with so much ridicule by Neale, Hume, and others, it was no more than this—“The Church of England, as governed by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, &c.” Yet Lord Digby called this, “the bottomless perjury of an *et cetera*.”

The canons, after receiving the approbation of the privy council, were subscribed by both the houses of convocation (with the exception of thirty-six protests); and being then passed for signature to the ecclesiastical parliament of York, they were confirmed by the King's letters patent under the great seal.

XXV. In the Long Parliament, which, in consequence of the Scottish invasion, the King summoned together in November, these canons were made the subject of warm discussion. The Puritans predominating in both houses, it was resolved, that no synodical acts can bind the clergy or laity, without consent of Parliament; that the late canons bind not either clergy or laity; that they contain matters contrary to the fundamental laws of the realm, and to the rights, property, and liberties of his Majesty's subjects; and lastly, that the benevolences granted, being illegal, ought not to bind the clergy.

These resolutions were the frettings of unreasonable malice, and assumptions of unlawful authority. The Convocation was called together by dif-

ferent writs from those of the Parliament; the members were deputed by the clergy, and being their representatives, could bind them: neither the canons of 1603, nor any others, were ever confirmed in Parliament; the act of 51 Edw. III. had only declared that the *Commons* should not be bound by canons, without their own consent, but said nothing of ecclesiastics: by 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, they were empowered to make canons with the King's consent, while the Parliament was never once mentioned; the Judges and Lord Keeper, who had been consulted on this occasion, pronounced the protracted session to be regular; the clergy had always taxed their own body; *the subsidy had been granted before the Parliament rose*; and had the case been otherwise, there was a precedent in the reign of Elizabeth, for the granting of a subsidy in convocation, when the Parliament was not sitting*.

XXVI. Laud, as chief framer of the canons, was exposed to many severe animadversions; and the Scottish commissioners having, at the same time, in a conference with the Commons, presented some articles of charge against him, an impeachment for high treason was sent up to the House of Lords, and led to his confinement in the Tower. Soon after, a specimen of the impartiality he had to expect was afforded in the

* Neale is wrong in stating that the subsidy was voted in the synod after the rising of Parliament.—Nelson, p. 545.

names of, "Very pander and broker to the Whore of Babylon," applied in the House of Commons to Windebank, his secretary ; as was to himself the phrase of, "An angry wasp, carrying his sting in the tail of every grievance."

XXVII. "Contracting regal power to stretch their own," is a line truly describing the conduct of the House of Commons. Chiefly busied concerning religious affairs, they settled puritanical ministers in all the principal churches : where faction usurped the place of loyalty, fanaticism of sound doctrine, and noise and cant of chaste and sober eloquence. "Vengeance," says Mr. Hume, "was taken for the silence and constraint in which, by the authority of Laud and the High Commission, these preachers had long been retained." Prynne, Bastwicke, and Burton, were recalled from their remote confinements, and welcomed back to London with boughs carried before them in triumph, with rosemary and bays in the hats of the mob, and flowers scattered along the road*. St. Antholine's church in London was given to the Scottish Commissioners, for the exercise of the Presbyterian worship ; and there the blind zeal of prodigious multitudes found music in the tones, and sense in the jargon of the

* These men experienced the generosity of this regenerating Parliament ; they were voted a sum of money, but never received it. Bishop Williams, Osbaldeston, and others, were at the same time enlarged.

North. Marshall and Burgess, puritanical ministers, preached seven hours before the House of Commons ; the sacramental table of that body, in St. Margaret's, Westminster, was removed to the middle of the aisle ; the communion service at the same church was interrupted by psalm-singing ; and the phrase, spiritual lords, was omitted in acts of Parliament ; in reading bills, the clerk of the upper house turned his back on the bench of bishops ; in going to church on a fast-day, the temporal peers took precedence of the spiritual ; and every thing, in short, indicated the preponderance of the Puritans, and the tottering condition of the hierarchy *. In the mean time, the more regular clergy, in discharging their public duties, or walking the streets in their distinctive habits, were exposed to insults and reviled as Popish priests ; while the Liturgy was condemned as a lifeless form of worship, and as quench-

* How these facts can accord with what Lord Clarendon and Neale affirm, that, with the exception of young Vane, Hampden, and Fiennes, the whole Parliament were inclined to episcopacy, is not clearly apparent. Both houses indeed condemned the interruption of the service at St. Margaret's ; yet Burgess's text was inflammatory enough—(Jerem. l. 5.)

“ They shall ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, saying, Come, let us join ourselves to the Lord by a perpetual COVENANT, &c.”

The professed attachment to episcopacy was no other than a canting deception, intended to entrap the undiscerning and the weak. It was attachment to presbyters with a president, which is no episcopacy at all.

ing the demonstrations of the Spirit. To this was added a Vandal ferocity against the fine arts, exhibited in the destruction of all paintings and other monuments, which might be considered as in the remotest degree favourable to idolatrous worship.

XXVIII. The two inflammable incitements, religious and political fury, being now combined, the meetings of the Commons were conducted with unrestrained violence: the usurpation of the bishops, the High Commission, the late convocation and its canons, were all virulently assailed: the oil and the water were shaken together; and in this ferment of minds, whatever dispositions might be favourable to a moderate reform in the church, could not easily be distinguished from those wholly inimical to all episcopal authority. As the manners of the Parliament descend to the people, every wild fanatic and self-sufficient reformer played his under-part in subscribing petitions against the church; and among these appeared prominent the *ROOT AND BRANCH PETITION*, signed by about 15,000 inhabitants of London, and praying that episcopal government might wholly cease*. The Commons, however, in a

* Many arts were used to obtain signatures; and at length the petition itself was torn off, to be replaced by another, which the great body of subscribers had never seen, and wholly disapproved. *Clar. vol. i. p. 204.*

Counter-petitions were, however, presented. Neale complains, that Lancashire *freeholders* were not proper judges of theological questions; but he has no scruples respecting the

body, were not yet ripe for so strong a measure of revolutionary madness. The Lords Digby and the accomplished Falkland delivered their sentiments in defence of the church establishment, with force, earnestness, and dignity. A counter-petition to the Root and Branch proposal was signed by great numbers of the nobility, gentry, and dignified clergy. To this succeeded, as a rejoinder, the Ministers' Petition, the production, in fact, of only ten or twelve clergymen, though they pretended that it had been subscribed by several hundreds of their brethren. Agreeably to its prayer, a bill was brought into the House of Commons, of which the object was to exclude ecclesiastics from civil employments, and the bishops from voting in the House of Lords. Much artifice was used to obtain the passing of that bill; Hampden, in particular, cajoling Lord Falkland into concurrence, by an assurance that, if the point were carried, no other attempt would be made, injurious to the Established Church. As many, not of the Puritan party, were of opinion, that the abstraction of the minds of ecclesiastics from secular con-

sound theology of that mob of 15,000 cockneys, draymen, fish-women, and similar divines, who subscribed the *Root and Branch Petition*.

Usher published a tract against the *Root and Branch* proposal, in which he proved the apostolical institution of episcopacy from Leontius, Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Irenæus, and Tertullian. An abstract of it may be found in Collier, vol. ii. p. 808.

cerns, would be advantageous to the interests of the Church, and as others were either blind to the remote views of the more violent Puritans, or afraid of offending them, supported as they were by the Scots, the bill passed the Commons. It was rejected, however, in the Upper House; but the Puritans, far from being discouraged by this defeat, soon brought in a bill for the total abolition of episcopacy; though, perceiving matters to be not yet quite in train for the extremities at which they aimed, they forbore to press it through the house for the present; contenting themselves with firing off the smaller artillery of bills against the convocation, the High Commission, images, altars, and crucifixes. Puns were passed upon the canons, which, it was smartly observed, ought to be dismounted, discharged, and melted down.

XXIX. With the most insufferable arrogance, the Commons next proceeded to appoint a court of inquisition on the clergy, which was generally termed the *Committee for scandalous Ministers* *.

* From this committee branched another, which was denominated the Committee for preaching Ministers. Lord Clarendon states, vol. i. p. 255, that not one orthodox or learned lecturer was recommended to any church in England from the beginning of the Parliament. At this time there was a curious struggle for presentations. Laud, now in prison, suffered his own livings to lapse to the crown, and excepted against persons presented for institution by other patrons. As the bishops in general objected to the political principles of the candidates, the Committee of Religion supplied vacancies

For several years this body persecuted all regular pastors, whose moderate sentiments they disliked, ejecting them from their livings, and sequestrating their benefices. Thus severely were visited the truly heinous offences of bowing at the awful name of Jesus, in compliance with a scriptural injunction, and wearing vestments, or observing ceremonies, prescribed by the laws of the land*.

as they best could, with preachers from New England ordained by presbyters, and probationers not ordained, bringing testimonials from either of the universities. In various instances mere laymen preached, and much inflammatory language was used both against the state and church.

* Many who espoused the party of the political malcontents, were averse from the religious views of the Puritans. "The hierarchy," says Mr. Hume, "had been established ever since the Reformation"—(he might as well have said, ever since the Norman conquest)—"the ancient fathers bore testimony to episcopal jurisdiction; and though parity MAY SEEM to have had place at first among Christian pastors, the period during which it prevailed was so short, that few undisputed traces of it remained in history."—Hume's Charles I. Finding, therefore, many attached to the ancient government of the church, the Puritans proceeded to the accomplishment of their aim by the indirect means of diminishing the power of the King, the patron of the hierarchy, and by exciting the popular hatred against the tyranny of the prelates. Zeal supplied their inferiority of numbers, and they deceived themselves in regarding their rancour as religious warmth; so that one furious enthusiast was able, by his active industry, to surmount the indolent efforts of many sober and reasonable antagonists.—See Hume.

Lord Clarendon, vol. i. p. 233, states, "That the Parliamentary party were not at this time entirely agreed respecting

XXX. A.D. 1641. One main evil arising from this extreme violence of the Puritans, was its repelling the court party further on the confines of Popery, than they were naturally inclined to have receded. To mark their abhorrence of Puritanism, they recoiled towards the pristine religion, which they deemed the inferior evil. Thus were their enemies supplied with a new ground of accusation, and they most unjustly charged the King with a design of introducing the ancient superstition. It is stated that Montague was favourable to the invocation of saints, that Cosins represented the real presence as remaining in the sacrament; that Adams spoke of confession as necessary to salvation; and that Heylin pronounced the difference betwixt the churches of England and Rome not to relate to essential points. In the English Pope, a work quoted by Neale, Sparrow is said to have paved the way for auricular confession, Watts for penance, Heylin for altar-worship, and Laud for the mass. Some of these accusations are groundless, and others overcharged; but, were they true to the uttermost, they could not justify the inference, that Charles was at heart a Papist. Neale himself,

the total abolition of episcopacy; the Root and Branch men alone demanding that measure. Yet the remainder were anxious to reduce the authority of bishops to a low ebb, and to abolish vestments and ceremonies. The Parliament, in short, was filled with fanatics, and the chief discontents were religious."

the most prejudiced of all writers, the most inveterate enemy of Charles and his council, can convict the government of no stronger evidence of Popery, than toleration extended to the Papists.

To allay the clamour, and to avoid unnecessary opposition, all the Papists throughout the kingdom were forthwith disarmed, and orders were issued for enforcing the laws against Jesuits; although the chief offence of the Catholics, at the time, was their having furnished the King with money towards resisting the Covenanters. “Did this in Cæsar seem ambition?” Is it thus that Popish attachments are manifested * ?

In Ireland, however, a short time after, the more barbarous Papists, emboldened by the success resulting from the intimidating measures of the Scots, disgraced Christianity, by one of the most horrid massacres recorded in the page of history †: an insurrection, in which the Puritans

* The army had been greatly composed of Catholics; and here it was sarcastically remarked, that the Queen’s army of Papists was gone to establish the Protestant religion in Scotland.

† A committee of accommodation sat in March, having ten bishops, and twenty lay lords to out-vote them. A sub-committee prepared matters for their consideration; and here we find the names of Usher, Hall, Prideaux, and Edmund Calamy. These bodies complained of the discipline then in use as too Popish and Arminian; they proposed several alterations in the ceremonies and Liturgy, and meditated the lopping of episcopacy, with a view to prevent its being felled. But this, with several other projects of ecclesiastical reform, came

saw their advantage, taking occasion to rail at the friends of the hierarchy as privy to the commotion, and as identified with Papists *.

to nothing; the anti-episcopal party "not caring to shave the beards of those whose heads they intended to cut off."

One of these plans, which the brandy-drinkers despised, as being no more than a milk and water potation, was the bill for putting down deans and chapters. Hacket, prebendary of St. Paul's, spoke with much force in their defence before the House of Commons. He urged that their daily service was useful in cathedrals, for supplying the defect of private prayer, and adding to religion the charm of celestial music. Their funds afforded a provision for learned and virtuous younger brothers, gave dignity to the Protestant religion, and honour to God; supported preaching, advanced learning, and kept in repair the most ornamental structures in the land. The clergy ought not to be like Jeroboam's priests. They paid first fruits, tenths, and subsidies; nor was it just that they should be disturbed in their hereditary charters. Burgess, in the evening, disputed on the other side, that though cathedrals were unnecessary, and quiremen scandalous, their land could not be given to private persons, or alienated to secular uses, without the guilt of sacrilege. It is pretty plain he wished to obtain a slice for himself.

Two other plans of mediation were dismissed for similar reasons; the one drawn up by Williams, for regulating the bishops, by adding to each twelve assistants; the other by Usher, for a mongrel church government—a mule begotten by Presbyterianism upon Episcopacy. Deeper projects than these were now in meditation. It is doubtful whether even Usher's scheme would have satisfied the Presbyterians; and the Root and Branch men would still have been malcontents.

* See Neale.—"Not without the knowledge of the court;" although he confesses the King's sanction of the insurrection to have been a forgery.

XXXI. It may be necessary to state, that the High Commission Court took arbitrary cognizance of heresies ; and the Star Chamber of civil offences beyond the reach of the law. These two engines of tyranny were now abolished ; the King giving his consent at the request of the bishops, who interfered in their proper character of peacemakers. Now was the time for all real friends of liberty to return, satisfied, to their allegiance ; but faction rose upon the condescension of authority, and the flimsy veil of pretended love of reform dropped off from the features of disaffection. Charles seemed already marked out as a victim : his unmeaning words, his most trivial actions, were strained and tortured into evil constructions ; and rumours of his tyrannous intentions were industriously circulated, having no other foundation than in the malice of his enemies. By these artifices the more furious Puritans expected to provoke the King into some violent exertion of power, which they might point out as urging the necessity of diminishing what was thus abused. Nor was it long before he fell into the snare thus artfully laid for him. But we pass over the impeachment of Strafford, and other civil transactions, confining ourselves to matters purely ecclesiastical.

XXXII. The bishops still forming, in the House of Lords, a formidable phalanx of opposition to the Puritans, thirteen of their number were impeached as chiefly guilty of promulgating

the late canons, in a manner contrary to the rights of Parliament, and dangerous to liberty. A respite of three months was granted for preparing their defence; and, in the mean time, a dispute arising between the two houses, concerning the continuance of the Liturgy, they adjourned themselves by mutual consent, each appointing a small committee. A report being spread, that the King having extended condescension to the Scots, designed to introduce Presbyterianism into England, he denied it in a letter from the North, and at the same time issued five *cong   d'elires* for the filling of vacant sees; while the bishops introduced on this occasion were men against whom no exception could reasonably be taken by the Puritans*. To a petition directed chiefly against the bishops, and the state of church government and discipline, the King delivered a most moderate and reasonable answer, signifying his determination to oppose Popery, and to abridge any excessive privileges of the clergy; but reminding the petitioners, that the bishops by law and usage had a right to vote in Parliament; and that he was resolved to support the church government and discipline against the irreverent attacks of separatists.

XXXIII. The inveteracy of the Commons

* Hall was removed to Norwich, and Prideaux appointed to Worcester; while Usher received the see of Carlisle in commendam. These were the last changes, until the total abolition of episcopacy in 1646.

against the Episcopal votes in Parliament, was increased by the opposition made by the bench of bishops, the body guards of the King, to all measures of hostility levelled against churches, which originated in the lower house. Determined to remove this obstacle to their designs, they stirred up the porters of London to petition against the spiritual lords, and a mob of apprentices, Burgess's myrmidons, to beset both houses of Parliament in an intimidating attitude, under pretence of obtaining an answer to their petition. With an admirable knowledge of cause and effect, these wise heads pronounced that Popery and prelacy had ruined trade. So at Rome, when the Tiber overflowed its banks, the inundation was said to be owing to the Christians; and so it was given out once by an old broom crier, that her besoms were rendered dearer by the French revolution*. From a shower of stones discharged by these politicians, the bishops, coming by water to Parliament on St. Stephen's day, had very nearly shared the fate of St. Stephen. A proposal having been made for the suppression of the tumult, Pym advised that the people should not be discouraged in manifesting the public sen-

* In a scuffle betwixt this mob and some disbanded officers who formed the King's guard at Whitehall, one David Hyde declared, that he would cut the throats of these round-headed dogs; and from this ^{me} the parties were known as *Cavaliers* and *Roundheads*.

timent. Parliamentary privilege was a convenient patriotic cry ; but it was forgotten when the King might find in it any advantage.

It being now rendered hazardous for the spiritual peers to attend their duty in Parliament, Williams, and twelve of his brethren, addressed the King and Lords, protesting against all proceedings during their compulsory absence. Although, according to Lord Clarendon, this protest was logical and legal, since whatever impedes the freedom of one member is a violation to that of all the rest, the protesting bishops were arraigned of high treason, and eleven of their number committed to the Tower*. To complete this flagrant outrage, the bill for abolishing their votes, and for excluding them from temporal authority, was again brought in and passed through both houses ; while London celebrated the triumph with bells and bonfires.

* Lord Newark delivered two powerful speeches in their behalf, urging, that to sit in Parliament was consistent with their spiritual vocation, and hindered not their other duties ; that the influence of court favour applied equally to laymen in the lower house, while the holiness and age of the bishops were securities against corruption ; and as for the other objection, “ he that warreth entangleth not himself with affairs of this life ; ” that it was a general rule which all men ought to observe, being a dissuasive from worldlymindedness. Constantine had a council of bishops in his camp.

Hall and Moreton were entrusted to the usher of the black rod, with five pounds a day, on account of their past services. Ten of the prelates were released after eighteen days imprisonment.

By the importunities of the Queen, whom artful or weak courtiers had persuaded, that this measure was necessary to the preservation of the throne, Charles was prevailed with, in a fatal moment, to sanction it with the royal assent. Thus fell the barrier between the King and his encroaching Commons, who now triumphed in the prospect of carrying all their measures unmolested by further opposition. Charles never afterwards enjoyed ease or security. His friends, weakened and despairing, silently withdrew from a fruitless contest, and left the way clear for the steady march of rebellion, to the final destruction of the monarchy*.

XXXIV. In inquiring whether the protest was justifiable on the part of the bishops, it was urged, that the lords spiritual were no third branch of the realm; that acts had been passed from which they had dissented in a body, as 1 Edw. VI. and 1 Eliz. the acts of conformity and supremacy; and that in their proceeding they supposed themselves of equal importance with the House of Commons. But who perceives not the fallacy of these objections? If the whole bench of bishops voluntarily retire, they form but a part of the House of Lords, which is, of course, concluded by a majority. But if any constituent part of that house is kept away by force, it is no House of Lords at all. Charles, in going to the House of Commons to demand the five members, was doubtless guilty of

* Clar. vol. i. p. 234, 246; Neale, p. 696.

an unconstitutional act ; and the historian of the Puritans, with justice, observes, If five members, why not five hundred ? Yet his majesty, the mob, may detain thirteen LORDS from their seats ; and Mr. Neale will not allow his own rule to operate here *.

XXXV. 1642. A controversy of the pen prepared the King and Parliament for the more destructive war of the sword ; and the first skirmishes were fought by the light troops of flying mercuries, lampoons, intelligencers, and journals : while the pulpits were not without their share in the action. To narrate the several stages of hostility, to muster the contending forces, to lead forth to the fight brothers against brothers, and sires against their sons, is the office of the civil historian. On these points we can touch no further than as they are connected with the changes in ecclesiastical affairs. In proportion, indeed, as intes-

* This episcopal protest was spirited and noble. “ When a man is about to be undone,” says Collier, “ to go out in smoke and smoulder is a mean way of coming to nothing. Let him spend himself in a blaze, and flash to the last grain of powder.”

This year, 1641, the Commons passed a resolution for the general demolition of altar-rails, and the removal of communion tables from the east end of the chancel to the body of every church. In executing this unpopular order, much violence was necessary ; and at St. Giles’s, Cripplegate ; at Halsted, in Essex ; at Canterbury, and other places, it was attended with tumults and scuffles betwixt the officers and parishioners.

tine war flamed with fiercer rage, the danger of the church became the more imminent: till when the aid of the Scottish covenanters was besought by the Parliament, her cause became utterly hopeless. The payment of 850*l.* a day, and the taking of the covenant by the Parliament, were the terms on which the Scots sold their services. This accession of force compelled the King, in self-defence, to gather Catholic troops around his standard: whose assistance, to avoid giving offence, he had at first refused.

XXXVI. Men of unfeigned piety, and of rigid principle, abounded, undoubtedly, on both sides. Yet as the party of the Puritans was the more demure, and that of the monarch the more cheerful, a hypocritical band naturally attached itself to the former, while the latter was not less alloyed and disgraced by the allegiance of all the open profligates in the nation. Of each of these appendages the opposite party took advantage, by extending its character over the whole body to which it belonged. With the royalists, all the Puritans were hypocritical; with “the Godly and well-affected,” as the Puritans entitled themselves, *all* the royalists were “the wicked and the malignant*.” These opposite tempers prevailing in the two camps, it is scarcely necessary to add, that

* Malignant—a word coined at this time, either from *ma-lus ignis*, bad fire, or *malum lignum*, bad fuel—a far-fetched and foolish etymology.

that of the Puritans possessed the advantage in point of military discipline. The cavaliers were licentious upon principle, to show that they were not grave, formal, and puritanical. Hence the more prudent royalists were heard to admit, that the King had the better cause, but the parliament the better men*.

XXXVII. Each camp, like that of the Israelites, was likewise accompanied by a mixed multitude. Puritans, Calvinists, lecturers, the clergy of the earlier school than Laud's, and such like, preached long discourses, vilified the King, and blew the trumpet of rebellion before the parliamentary army. It was the custom of these men to apply to Charles the denunciations of the prophets respecting the worst of the Jewish kings†. It is quite laughable to hear Mr. Neale affirming, on the contrary, that these preachers were all conformists, and that their sermons continually inculcated the principle, that the King can do no

* Yet Warburton contradicts this, by citing a speech of Cromwell's, in which he boasts of having infused religion into the mass.

† See Claren. vol. i. p. 30.—Amongst other subtleties, a line of distinction was drawn betwixt the personal and political capacity of the monarch: and it was affirmed that the people might destroy Charles Stuart, without hurting the King. The monarch however, not exactly perceiving the justness of this nice distinction, in order that he might save the King, took means for preserving Charles Stuart.—Heylin Hist. Presbyt.

wrong. Be this as it may, their sway was nearly despotic. While Henderson intermeddled more in northern politics than all the bench of Scottish bishops had formerly done, Burgess and Marshall possessed stronger influence over the two houses than Laud had ever boasted at court. Selden, Lightfoot, Cudworth, Pococke, Whichcote, and Arrowsmith, are enrolled by the Puritan historian, as attached to the parliament: but Warburton thinks, with higher probability, that they submitted in neutrality, and were not followers of the party. Lastly, a rabble joined the parliamentary force, having chosen their side, not through any ability to settle the question of right, but because they had heard the cavaliers SWEAR FOR the King, and the roundheads PRAY AGAINST him.

Usher, Hall, Moreton, Westfield, Brownrigge, Prideaux, Hammond, Sanderson, all the bishops, in short, and many eminent divines, the fellows of both the universities, together with the cathedral and most of the parochial clergy, were gathered as satellites round the King. The royal army being unruly, and subsisting on their plunder, Charles, by a proclamation, forbade their excesses.

XXXVIII. In the mean time, the metropolis witnessed the removal of all open vices and ostensible indecorums. Public diversions ceased, though it seems an ordinance was requisite to stop them, and in their stead was established a monthly fast,

together with a seven o'clock in the morning lecture or exercise* "You might walk through London on the evening of the Lord's day," says a writer, "and not see one idle person, or hear any thing but the voice of prayers and praises from churches and private houses." No barber would shave on Sunday; no ferryman would carry a passenger across the Thames; nor could a man even sit undisturbed at his own door. We doubt not that in these devotions and decencies, there was much genuine piety, and so far they are worthy of our admiration; but it is a melancholy truth that the heart may sing psalms, and yet be deceitful above all things †.

* The Parliament appointed also a weekly fast for every Wednesday, while that of the King was held every Friday: and thus, it was said, both parties called Almighty God into the quarrel.

† On one occasion, 8 Aug. 1641, this same goldly parliament, pleading necessity, sate all Sunday for the dispatch of business. What would they have said, had this been done by the opposite party? How easily do we excuse in our own conduct the offences we condemn in that of our brethren!

CHAPTER XI.

FROM THE BREAKING OUT OF THE CIVIL WAR TO
THE MARTYRDOM OF CHARLES.

Contents.

- I. *Origin of the War.*—II. *Assembly of Divines.*—III. *Attempt to alter the Thirty-nine Articles.*—IV. *The Covenant taken by the Parliament and Assembly.*—V. *Persecution of malignant Ministers who refused Subscription.*—VI. *Ordinance for defacing the Beauty of Churches.*—VII. *Abolition of the Hierarchy: Religious Parties: State of Religion.*—VIII. *The Directory for Public Worship and Assembly's Catechisms.*—IX. *The trial of Laud.*—X. *His Execution and Character.*—XI. *Treaty of Uxbridge.*—XII. *Rise of the Independents in the Army: Fanatical Lay Preachers.*—XIII. *Debates among the religious Parties; and Settlement of the Presbyterian Discipline.*—XIV. *The King surrenders himself to the Scots—Conduct of the Parliament.*—XV. *Charles's Controversy with Henderson relative to the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy.*—XVI. *Proposals from the Parliament.*—XVII. *The Scots sell the King to the Parliament.*—XVIII. *Seizure of the King by the Army.*—XIX. *His removal to Carisbrook Castle.*—XX. *Vote for no further Addresses to the King.*—XXI. *The Scots invade England.*—XXII. *Treaty of the Isle of Wight.*

—XXIII. *Trial and Martyrdom of Charles.*—XXIV. —*His Character.*—XXV. *Miscellaneous Matters: Opinions on the Civil War—Conduct of Universities.* —XXVI. *Catholics.*—XXVII. *Acts of Parliament.* —XXVIII. *Learned Divines.*—XXIX. *Presbyterians.*—XXX. *Independents.*

I. 1643.—**B**ISHOPS Burnet and Kennett, furious against Popery, throw all the odium and blame of the civil war upon the Queen. But this is vulgar prejudice: ship-money had been given up; the Star-chamber and High Commission-court suppressed; Strafford* executed; the episcopal votes abolished; the power of the Bishops in their courts retrenched; the triennial act passed; every reasonable demand satisfied; every fair concession made; and, in fine, every disposition to conciliation manifested. The origin of the war then was with the Puritans alone: it was THEIR insatiable spirit of encroachment; it was their lawless invasion of the royal prerogative; it was, in short, their claim of the militia, and other unconstitutional demands, that ripped up the bosom of their mother country.

* When Charles hesitated in signing the death-warrant of Strafford, Williams, it is said, gave him strange casuistical advice: "A king has a public and a private conscience: and he might do that as a king from his public conscience, which militated against his private conscience as a man."

This is the precise language of Sir Pertinax Macsycophant. "There's twa sorts o' consciences, Maister Sydney; the parliamentary conscience, and the common conscience," &c.

II. The attempt made in the treaty of Oxford to obtain the royal consent to the abolition of episcopacy having failed, an ordinance was passed in parliament for the meeting of learned and godly divines, who should take the Liturgy, government, and doctrines of the church, under consideration. This measure was adopted for the gratification of the Scots, who had demanded an uniformity in doctrine and discipline betwixt the two nations. The jealous Parliament however appointed that the assembly should be only a deliberative body, having no ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Its members were not less an object of attention : instead of being delegated by the beneficed clergy (for that would have been making the distempered patients their own physicians), they were elected by the knights and burgesses, two being returned for each county. Consequently, of 121 divines, a large majority were openly hostile to the doctrine and discipline of the establishment ; men of mean learning, and many likewise of scandalous morals*. To these were added, thirty lay assessors ; ten being lords and twenty commoners. The great proportion were favourers of the Presbyte-

* Claren. vol. i. p. 530.—But Mr. Baxter, to whom Neale always acts handsomely the gentleman-usher, by introducing him as “ Mr. Baxter, who was much better acquainted with these things,” will have it that they were all, all honourable men, of great learning, godliness, fidelity, and ministerial abilities.

rian discipline; but there were some friends of episcopacy; four non-conformists turned dissenters, i. e. independents; and five Scotch commissioners*. In their debates, much deference was paid to the opinions of Lightfoot and Selden, the one a moderate Presbyterian, the other an Erastian. Usher was nominated, but, with the whole episcopalian party, either did not appear, or withdrew on the taking of the covenant. Although the King forbade this meeting by proclamation, sixty-nine assembled, July 1, in the Jerusalem chamber; the fittest place, as it was called, for the re-building of Sion. To each member was granted four shillings a day; while the vacancies were recruited by divines, superadded by the Parliament. On withdrawing, the royalists assigned, as their reasons for absence, that the assembly had not been convoked by the King, which was necessary to a council; that it was forbidden by royal proclamation; that being not chosen by the clergy, its members were not representatives; that the meeting seemed designed to supersede the convocation; that the puritanical clergy and laity regarded them as spies; and that they would not remain to be out-voted, and employed to countenance the proceedings of men assembled to pull down what they would not uphold.

III. The Assembly opened their proceedings

* The convocation of this mixed assemblage was not unaptly denominated—the ploughing with an ox and an ass.

with a professed attempt to alter the Thirty-nine Articles to a Calvinistic form; (they were not then considered as Calvinistic;) guarding nevertheless against the Antinomian errors of Crisp, Eaton, and Saltmarsh. More than two months were spent in debating on the first fifteen; which terminated only in two slight and immaterial changes in the ninth and eleventh articles*. At length, the Scottish commissioners arriving, ridiculed and set aside this milk and water revision, while they insisted on subscription to the covenant as a preliminary measure.

IV. This instrument, for the preservation of religion in Scotland, as to doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, and its reformation in England and Ireland, so as to bring the three kingdoms to the nearest possible conjunction, a measure to be effected by the extirpation of Popery and prelacy, was accordingly agreed to by the Commons in parliament, Sept. 25, 1643. The same day it was read to the divines in St. Margaret's, Westminster, every one lifting up his hand to heaven in token of the most solemn assent. On the 15th of October it was subscribed by

* In the ninth, the words—"together with Adam's sin imputed," were inserted; and "very far gone," was changed into "wholly deprived of." The addition to the eleventh article consisted in the words—"Notwithstanding God doth not forgive them that go on still in their wickedness." Such is Mr. Neale's account.—Appendix to vol. ii.

the Lords, after a sermon (Nehem. x. 29) on entering into a CURSE—All persons above eighteen years of age were then ordered to accept the covenant: by imposing which as a test (with penalties for not signing a contract, the validity of which implies consent), the Parliament evinced that they who clamour the loudest for liberty of conscience, are the most prompt to infringe it when they are established in power*.

V. When we consider that the covenant militated against the oath of supremacy, which declared the King to be spiritual head in church matters; against the laws of the land which established prelacy; against the oath of canonical obedience; and against the consent of the King, who forbade it by proclamation in October;—we shall not wonder at its being refused by a large body of the clergy. This sharpened and increased the persecution of malignant pastors, which had for some time been carried on by the two committees for religion, and for scandalous ministers. False and frivolous accusations were now preferred against the clergy, by witnesses no lon-

* In Scotland, the goods of those who refused the covenant were seized, and their persons apprehended. "Such," says the Puritan Historian in a rapture of admiration, "such was the unbounded zeal of that people."

It was remarked that the covenant contained 666 words, the number of the beast in the Apocalypse, Rev. xiii. 18.

ger put upon their oath ; and the calumnies of mean persons and enemies to the church condemned a pastor in opposition to the general praise of his parishioners*. Indeed the necessity for any witnesses was now in great measure superseded ; since a man was condemned by simple refusal to accept the test. All recusants were summarily removed from their benefices : Fuller states that the veins of the English church were by this measure emptied of much good blood ; and Lord Clarendon affirms that all the learned and orthodox clergy were ejected : but Mr. Baxter, “ who was much better acquainted with these things,” maintains that only the insufficient and scandalous ministers were cast out†. Now among these insufficient and scandalous ministers, were Usher, Juxon, Hall, and Moreton. Fuller the historian had left his lectureship in the Savoy, and fled to the royal quarters some time before. The whole number ejected is admitted by Neale to have been 1600 ; but Walker’s Index numbers 2400. In London alone, 115 ministers were removed ; and by the purgation of Cambridge, 195 graduates were deposed from their benefices and expelled the university. To the sum amassed by sequestering the estates of these outcasts, the Parliament, by a grasp of abominable iniquity, added two-thirds of

* Clarendon—Fuller—Walker’s Sufferings.

† It is but justice to Mr. Baxter to state, that he prevented the covenant from being subscribed in Worcestershire.

the estates of all Papists. To the wife and children of each ejected minister, one fifth part of the revenues of his benefice was decreed: but, owing to the rapacity of the new incumbents, and the delicate consciences of many farmers, pious souls! who now began seriously to think that the payment of tythes was unlawful—even this scanty pittance was grudged and ill-paid.

Among so large a number of deprived ministers, it is not to be questioned that some were but little creditable to their sacred profession. Of the faults of these, advantage was taken, to justify the general spoliation, and a book appeared, with the title of the first century, recording the delinquencies of 100 sequestered divines. Charles was solicited to sanction a counter-publication, which should blazon the vicious lives of the parliamentary ministers; but with great judgment he suppressed the project, declaring that recrimination is not self-acquittal, and that such reciprocal exposures would scandalize both parties in the eyes of their common enemies the Papists.

VI. In the mean time, a furious ordinance was passed by the two houses, against Popery, pictures, altars, fonts, crosses, images, copes, surplices, and organs. In executing this direction, a brutal ferocity was manifested; and “the beauty of cathedrals was somewhat defaced,” as the historian without prejudice expresses himself.

Now let us see how this, somewhat defaced,

is to be construed. When Winchester was taken, the whole furniture of the choir, the glass windows and tombs, were totally demolished. At Chichester, the eyes of a statue of Edward VI. were plucked out, as a punishment for his having established the Liturgy. One cup being here requested out of the spoil of the plate, for the purpose of administering the Sacrament, the ministers were commanded to serve their turn with a wooden dish. The plunderers were English Presbyterians, led on by Scottish officers: while Waller, like Nero, “jussit scelera, non spectavit.” The cathedral of Exeter was profaned and defiled with pollutions too abominable to be named. Thus sped fanaticism in its full and uncontrolled career. In Canterbury, the organs, robes, and velvet cloths, the spread eagle, the altar rails, the arras hangings, were all destroyed. On these last were wrought various figures of our Saviour: the soldiers swore they would stab him, and rip up his bowels; which blasphemous threats they actually realized, with regard to his similitude on the tapestry. At an image of our Lord also, they discharged forty muskets; rejoicing triumphantly whenever they hit him on the face. But these shocking excesses were even surpassed by those at Westminster; where the brutal soldiery burnt the altar-rails as they stood, and then sate down with several of their lecturers, to smoke tobacco and drink ale on the communion table. This

hallowed spot was covered with abominations, similar to those at Exeter. Somewhat defaced*!

VII. From this period may be dated the entire downfall of the hierarchical power, though it was not yet formally abolished by an ordinance. Henceforward each parish chose its own minister, who was examined by the assembly, and confirmed by the Parliament.

To supply so many vacancies as were now occasioned in the church, regular ministers were not to be obtained; nor, indeed, had they been found, is it probable they would have been admitted. Silenced lecturers, hanging on chaplains, Presbyterians from Scotland or New England, Dutch preachers, unlearned persons, youths whose orders got the speed of their degrees, and, if we believe the Oxford royalists, even butchers, cobblers, and bricklayers, succeeded to abdicated preferments. Though pluralities had been an abuse complained of as disgracing the church, there were now Puritans reconciling their tender consciences to both the dual and plural number in the matter of livings. These, with consummate cant, pleaded the example of Saunders the martyr, who had refused to resign one of his benefices because it would fall into the hands of a Papist: and, like him, they too in conscience declined parting with

* At this time, St. Paul's Cross and Charing Cross were pulled down. The Book of Sports was burnt publicly in Cheapside, by the common hangman.

one of theirs, lest they should chance to make way for a malignant. In the mean time, vicarages of inferior value, though important as cures of souls, remained unprovided with ministers: "for rich maids," it was said, "have many suitors, while the unportioned damsel may die a virgin*." All these new incumbents however were only tenants at will†. Neale declares that this was a merciful act of the Parliament, with the view of restoring all the livings to their rightful owners, on the cessation of hostilities, and accommodation of differences. Kind souls! and liberal Mr. Neale!

The complete introduction of the Presbyterian religion, was certainly not at first contemplated by the majority of the Commons; but it being

* "These infamous men," observes Milton, himself a republican, concerning the Assembly divines, "after preaching against pluralities, seized, or not unwillingly accepted, besides their public salary, sometimes one, two, or more, of the best livings, collegiate masterships in the universities, and rich lectureships in the city, setting sail to all winds that might blow gain into their covetous bosoms.

"Because you have thrown off your prelate lord,
 "And with stiff vows renounced the liturgy,
 "To seize the widowed whore, Plurality,
 "From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorred; &c.
 "When they shall read this plainly in your charge,
 "New Presbyter, is but old Priest writ large."

The assembly, says Neale, was often turned into a house of prayer: and he might have added, sometimes into a den of thieves.

† Suff. Clergy, p. 119.

made a stipulation in the Scottish treaty, they yielded to the urgency of the occasion. The anti-episcopal minority, who had been blended hitherto under the common appellation of Puritans, now obtaining the ascendancy, separated into the three different branches of Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians. Of the two former we shall treat at the conclusion of the present chapter. The Erastians acknowledged, as their leader, Erastus a physician, and native of Baden, who had died in 1583. In a controversy with Beza, he maintained that excommunication, and the whole church power in every Christian state, rested with the secular authority. According to his disciples, then, church government, like ceremonies, was left to the discretion of each state; and no spiritual power, no influence saving that of persuasion, such as a lecturer in an university possesses over his pupils, belonged to the sacerdotal character. Lightfoot was an Erastian; and, together with Colman, cited the Hebrew original for the power of princes in ecclesiastical matters.

The Parliament encouraged the Erastians, and kept the Scottish party in check: and when Presbyterianism was at length established, it had a tincture of the principles of Erastus.

1644. In the assembly episcopacy was now without a single advocate; and even the moderate Presbyterians, who would have admitted the mock episcopacy of presidents, had given way to the

Scottish ascendancy. Laud had recently been suspended from his office, benefice, and jurisdiction, for disobeying an act of the two houses, forbidding him to collate to benefices in his gift, unless by their nomination. And as the bishops refused in general to ordain any candidates for the ministry who favoured not the royal cause, a question was now started in the assembly, whether in this exigence ordination might not be conferred by presbyters. An ordinance, prescribing the form of ordination, was accordingly passed by the two houses of Parliament. Ten members of the assembly, and thirteen presbyters of London, seven of which body were to constitute a quorum, were empowered by this regulation to examine candidates for the ministry, and to ordain by imposition of hands*. From this time, during nearly eighteen years, episcopacy ceased to be the established government in England; though, for want of the concurrence of the third branch of the legislature, it was never entirely dissolved: nor, indeed, was it till the year 1646 that the names and dignities of bishops were taken away. The sequestration of prebends took place nearly about the same time; but the names of deans and chapters, and the cathedral service, were fully extinguished only after the death of the King.

* Dr. Bohea, chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, wrote a tract on the invalidity of the ordination conferred by them. It was never answered.

As the Liturgy, though not formally abolished until the following year, had now for some time been suffered to fall into disuse, no regular mode of worship was at present observed; some wore a surplice, and others a gown and cassock—some paid no regard whatever to the Book of Prayer, and others read what portions of it suited their taste or their purposes. Bishop Kennett writes, that tithes, in these times of trouble, were withheld from such ministers as read the Liturgy; and he might have added, with equal truth, from such also as did not read it. In the mean time fanaticism and hypocrisy exhibited their freaks, in all possible modes of impious absurdity. Fervors, visions, and pretended revelations, almost superseded the authority of the Sacred Volume. The ruin of the church announced the fall of the civil establishment: it led on to that catastrophe which has taught us that, like Saul and Jonathan, they are lovely and pleasant in their lives, and that in death they cannot be divided.

VIII. 1645. To give a partial check to the extravagances above recited, a DIRECTORY for public worship was issued in January 1645, repealing the acts of Edward and Elizabeth for establishing the Liturgy*. While this syllabus of united prayer en-

* In favour of abolishing the Liturgy, it was urged, that it was offensive to churches abroad, and to godly persons at home; that Calvin had pronounced many of its contents, *tolerabiles ineptiæ*; that the Papists approved of much of it,

joined a certain order for proceeding in the service of the church, it left the ministers at liberty to talk what sense or nonsense they pleased, on all the points prescribed, both in their supplications and their sermons. It was, however, found impracticable to carry this ordinance at once into effect; in some places Directories could not be procured; in others they were wholly disregarded. One man read the whole, another a part of the Common Prayer; a third a form of his own, and a fourth a medley of both, while the highflyers scorned to be confined within the trammels of any direction or form

as confirming them in their idolatrous worship; that it was too long, and prescribed burdensome ceremonies; and that it confined the operations of the Spirit, thus at once excluding able ministers who scrupled to use it, and rendering those who conformed idle and unedifying. Its advocates replied, that no foreign church had signified its dislike to this service in print, and that at home many of the most pious men had approved of it; that Calvin is but one man; and that his expression applied only to that first draught, which afterwards underwent two revisions in the reign of Edward and Elizabeth; that it is charitable and right to comply with the Papists in matters undoubtedly derived from antiquity, though not in what idolatry had superadded; that the users of the Liturgy labour in preaching, catechizing, and study; that the Directory itself hinders not from mental laziness, though it calls for stronger lungs and sides; that the extemporary prayers and preaching of the Puritans occupy nearly as much time as the Liturgy and sermon of the Conformists; that a pruning, not an abolition of ceremonies, was designed by the Reformation; and that even the Directory confines the Spirit as to matter.

whatsoever. To reduce these varieties to some uniformity, the Parliament soon after called in the Prayer Book, imposing a fine on every minister who should refuse compliance with the form prescribed by the Directory, together with intolerant penalties for using the Liturgy in private families. With the same regard to liberty of conscience, about which so violent an outcry had been raised, fines were denounced against all persons among the laity who should refuse to follow the Directory, or who should write or speak in its disparagement. To defeat this plan, the King, by proclamation, 13th Nov. 1645, enjoined the use of the Common Prayer Book, and forbade the admission of the Directory; while he assured the Lords at Oxford, that his determination was firm and unaltered, to live and die for the privileges of his crown, for his friends, and for church government. Under these opposite injunctions, the people were, at this time, not unaptly compared to the waves of the sea, commanded one way by the wind, and countermanded another way by the tide.

By the Directory, all private and lay baptism, and the sign of the cross, were discontinued*. The Lord's Supper was duly to be administered in

* The child was to be presented by its father, or by a friend in the father's absence. The minister was to declare outward baptism to be not so necessary, as that the want of it endangered salvation. Salutations in church are forbidden: a wise direc-

private; the obnoxious word altar was changed into table, and the table removed into the body of the church, while the people were permitted, in communicating, to stand or to sit at their pleasure. Marriage in Lent was allowed, and the ring in that rite was laid aside. The Apochrypha, the Saints' days, the particular vestments, were abolished. In visiting the sick, no private confession, no authoritative absolution, was permitted; and the dead were to be interred, like dogs, without a funeral service. Neither the use of the Creed, nor of the Ten Commandments, was enjoined; and when this point came to be debated by the Commons, the silence of the divines on these important parts of the service was confirmed by a

tion; for reverent behaviour is becoming in the presence chamber. Prayer was directed to be offered for the King, that he might be saved from evil counsel; for the Queen, that she might be converted; and for the Parliament, then in open rebellion, that it might prosper. The whole Lord's day was to be spent in religious exercises. In the prayer after the sermon, the heads were to be turned into petitions; and the Lord's Prayer was recommended. In the sermon the introduction was ordered to be short and clear; the divisions to follow the order of matter and not of the words: the audience were not to be burdened with many parts, or perplexed with terms of logic or art; and difficulties arising from the nature of the subject, or the prejudices of the hearers, were to be unravelled. Learned languages, uncommon phrases, affected cadences, and quotations from human authors, were all to be avoided.

majority of eight or ten voices *. Both the Creed and Decalogue, however, were afterwards printed in the Assembly's Confession. The observance of Christmas day was altogether prohibited.

Besides the Directory and the Confession, which was also Calvinistic, making God the author of sin, the Westminster divines published a larger catechism, which was, in fact, the Confession in question and answer; but as this was deemed too ample to be taught in schools, and too difficult for the understandings of children, a lesser or abridged catechism was soon after added. None of these compositions maintained the divine right of presbytery.

IX. Laud had, for almost five years, languished in the Tower, under an impeachment for high treason. He was now drawn out for trial and condemnation, in order to gratify the Scots †. It

* Lord Pembroke being afterwards asked privately the reason of this omission, replied, "That it was matter of regret to him and others; but that the Lords did not, at that juncture, wish to manifest a difference with the Commons."

† The whole of this process occupied five months, during which Laud was heard twenty days in his defence. The mornings were spent in substantiating the charges against him; after an interval of a few hours his pleading was received: the managers for the prosecution were next permitted to reply, after which the prisoner was conveyed back to the Tower every evening about eight o'clock. It thus appears, that with the enemies of Laud rested every advantage of concert, preparation, and rejoinder. As the trial involved the discussion of all the important questions agitated at that period, I have thought proper to enter into a minute and critical account of

is not, here, my intention, as it is no part of my province, to detail or discuss accusations merely of a civil nature ; although it may be just hinted, that Laud's principle of defence was a solid one ; namely, that a crime, such as treason, cannot be constituted by any accumulation of circumstances, no one of which is separately treasonable †. But

it, the more particularly since Laud, who, though furnished with counsel, rested chiefly on his own resources, could not promptly answer the preconceived charges and arguments urged by his learned antagonists * ; since the managers in their replies were guilty of the grossest mis-statements, and, lastly, since the most popular accounts of the proceedings are either garbled and imperfect, or taken from Mr. Prinne's narrative ; the narrative of a determined enemy to the archbishop.

† Among the charges, one accused Laud of having declared, that Parliament could not alter the state of religion, without consent of the clergy ; whereas the clergy were adverse to the Reformation. He maintained that he only alluded to the power of the church to judge concerning truth and falsehood, as they respected heresies. The repairing of St. Paul's was one of his faults ; but he had paid towards that work 1200*l.* from his own coffers. The charge of bribery he heard with the liveliest indignation ; and it appeared that this alluded merely to a butt of sack which a person had smuggled into his cellar, and

* The counsel for the Commons were Wild, Hayward, Brown, Nicholas, and Hill (which last person, as he said nothing, the archbishop termed Consul Bibulus), with Prinne for the solicitor. Laud's solicitor was his own secretary *.

The late republication of some editions and abridgments of Neale, suggest also the propriety of correcting, here as elsewhere, that author's numerous and pernicious distortions of truth.

* See Wharton's History of Laud's Troubles, 223, &c.

the third general accusation being purely of a religious nature, demands particular attention. In substance it imputed to Laud an attempt to introduce idolatry, and to reconcile the church of England to that of Rome*.

which, when he discovered it, he ordered to be removed. It was urged that he had accepted commutations for fines; this, however, was not done clandestinely, but by warrant under the great seal, and in order to raise a fund for repairing the metropolitan cathedral. To the imputation of bringing the temporal power into subjection to the clergy, he answered, that he had only endeavoured to exempt the clergy from lay oppression. In short, he had asserted the prerogative only where the law was silent; and all the acts complained of were not properly his, but those of the whole council-board.

* The first particular specified was his partiality for images and pictures, evinced in the repairing of the stained-glass windows of his private chapel in Lambeth, contrary to the stat. 3 and 4 Edward VI. and the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth; the erection of crosses in various churches, and of a stone figure of the Virgin in St. Mary's, Oxford; with the summoning of Mr. Sherfield before the Star-chamber, for defacing an idolatrous sculpture in a church near Salisbury. To this Laud replied, that images were in use so early as the time of Constantine, and earlier; that Tertullian mentions a congregation who had a picture of Christ on their communion chalice; that even Calvin allowed the historical use of scriptural representations, since he says (*Instit. lib. i. c. 11, § 12*), "*Neque tamen eâ superstitione teneor, ut nullas prorsus imagines ferendas censeam, sed quia sculptura et pictura Dei dona sunt, puram et legitimam utrusque usum requiro.*" An historical account of images is given in the Homilies (p. 64, 65); but though it might be granted, that they were forbidden by that publication, one might surely subscribe the Homilies as godly

Laud, in his closing speech, complained of want of time for preparation ; of the seizure of his

and profitable for THOSE times, yet not believe them as to every direction necessary at all times. He did not approve of images of God the Father ; though some vindicated the use of them, from Dan. vii. The similitudes of Lambeth were neither wood nor stone, but glass windows. As to crosses and pictures, images of things visible, they might be serviceable for ornament and admonition. The statue of the Virgin had been set up by Bishop Owen : nor was it in proof that he even was aware of its existence ; and Mr. Sherfield was sentenced for violently destroying the ornaments of a church without authority from the bishop of the diocese.

In answer to this defence, it was argued by the managers, that Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenæus, and Lactantius, agree in the denying images to have been found in the primitive churches ; that Epiphanius, in holy indignation, rent an image in pieces ; that the Homilies, part ii. p. 38, show ancient councils and many pious emperors to have been averse from images ; that Tertullian relates only that those heretics to whom he wrote had such a chalice as Laud alluded to ; and that Calvin, in the sentence quoted, must refer only to the use of sculpture and painting in common life, since his next words affirm that the church had no images for 500 years, and that to paint images of God is unlawful, since he hath himself forbidden it. In this manner the trial proceeded ; Laud being allowed only one short and almost unpremeditated answer, while the managers had the first blow and the last in each particular charge. It is therefore a just debt to the memory of the archbishop, to examine the pleadings of his antagonists ; and with this view it may be observed that the managers, with dexterous management, suppressed the distinction betwixt images as ornaments, and as objects of worship. The managers had asserted that the stained window

papers and diary, not to substantiate but to construct a charge; and of the sifting of these docu-

at Lambeth was repaired from the model in a Roman missal: whereas, Laud merely attempted to restore what had been defaced. This window, which was afterwards destroyed in the civil wars*, represented the scripture history from the creation to the last judgment. In two side windows were portrayed the types and anti-types. Now if Laud had indeed repaired such a window from a missal, where would have been the mighty harm? But it seems this repairing was unlawful, because the window had been defaced at the Reformation. It is unpardonable then to correct any mischief occasioned by the wild and riotous excess of a good principle. And now let us examine the 3 and 4 of Edward VI. and the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth. The statute 1 Eliz. c. ii. † refers to this act of Edward VI. and orders matters to stand as they did at the time of its passing: but the act of Edward VI. commands only the destruction of images in wood, stone, and alabaster, speaking nothing at all concerning glass windows; and containing an express clause for the preservation of IMAGES on monuments, &c. provided they were not reputed to be saints. The act then was rather favourable than otherwise to the repair of the Lambeth window. But the act 1 Eliz. c. ii. was passed in the year 1558; whereas the INJUNCTIONS were delivered in 1559, and may be conceived as intended to explain or qualify the act. And what is the language of these injunctions? After commanding the demolition of images in the churches, they add, "PRESERVING nevertheless and repairing both the walls and GLASS WINDOWS; these then might be repaired with STAINED glass, provided saint-worship were not introduced.

II. The second charge accused Laud of superstition in the

* Ducarel's Lambeth, p. 26; and Lyson, vol. i. p. 259.

† See Gibson's Codex, and the Collections of old Canons.

ments to the bran. The articles he said were general and vague. He had been charged with

consecration of churches, and instanced those so well known of St. Catharine Cree and St. Giles's. * This was said to be contrary to the judgment of Bishop Pilkington and Archbishop Parker. The consecration of altars, pattens, chalices, altar-cloths, and even of the knife which should cut the sacramental bread, the dedication of churches to saints or angels, and the promotion of annual commemorative feasts, were likewise subjects of complaint †.

The consecration of churches, said the Archbishop, is as old as the days of Moses and Solomon, who thus hallowed the tabernacle and the temple. Christian churches were consecrated in the reign of Constantine, or as soon as they began to be built; and that of Tyre is specified by Eusebius: nor does Parker condemn consecrations in general, but Popish consecrations, which mine were not, for I had the forms of them from Bishop Andrews ‡.

There was no consecration, replied the directors of the trial, for 300 years after the birth of Christ.—It is true that Eusebius, in the life of Constantine, cap. 45, mentions the consecration of a temple with prayers, &c.; but there was no

* Prynne, p. 114, 497.

† See Prynne, p. 115—Laud's History, p. 339.

‡ Consecrations are advisable for the sake of solemnity: and as to distinguishing churches by the names of saints and angels, it was an ancient practice; but the dedication was only to God. Our Lord honoured a feast of dedication with his presence; and such feasts are useful for maintaining hospitality and good neighbourhood. They were prevalent in Popish times, and have led to occasional excesses; but are all vines to be rooted up, because some men will intoxicate themselves with the juice of the grape? Further, the altar is necessarily holy; for we know that it sanctified the gift: ought it not then to be consecrated or set apart from common uses? And were not all its appurtenances hallowed in this manner, what could be understood by the crime of sacrilege?

hasty words : with the actions of other men ; nay with the decrees of whole courts and councils.

knocking of doors, and crying of " Open ye everlasting gates : " there was no throwing of dust into the air. Consecration is a Popish invention. The feast of dedication mentioned in John, x. 22, was commemorative of the altars spoken of in 1 Maccab. iv. 56, 59 : and a passage stating the presence of our Lord at Jerusalem, during a feast held by superstitious Jews, signifies not his approval of that feast. The tabernacle was consecrated by Moses the civil magistrate ; and the temple by Solomon the King : neither of them by the High Priest. Moses, by an express command, anointed the tabernacle and its contents with oil ; while Solomon only uttered an excellent prayer in the outer court of the temple ; and hallowed the middle court with offerings. There is no mention in Scripture, however, of the consecration of synagogues ; which are analogous to our common churches : though to argue from a Jewish to a Christian house of worship, is after all a method of reasoning to be excepted against. Many places, such as Jerusalem, the HOLY city, bore a character of holiness, without formal consecration. The archbishop derived his forms, it seems, not from the Missal but from Bishop Andrews : yet what is this but receiving them from the Missal at second hand ? The forms of consecrating altars, chalices, and pattens, were all of them extracted from the Roman Missal. Wakes were introduced by Popes Felix and Gregory. They produced so much debauchery, that Henry VIII. restrained them all to the first Sunday in October : and afterwards they were wholly abolished by the 5 and 6 of Edward VI. On their gradually creeping in again, Judge Richardson suppressed them in some of the western counties : an order which the archbishop reversed in the following year.

On this replication of the managers we may briefly remark, that Laud, right in his principle, doubtless carried his appli-

He had been censured for the repair of St. Paul's, and for improving the statutes of Oxford, for

cation of it to a superstitious and childish excess. As supporting the general charge of idolatry and Popery, the accusation fell totally short of its aim*.

III. The same may be affirmed concerning the third article of complaint; which accused Laud of removing communion tables from the body of the church to the east end of the chancel; and of encompassing them every where with rails: of furnishing out his own chapel and the King's at Whitehall with basins, candlesticks, and the credentia or side-table, according to the Roman ceremonial: and of hanging over the altar an arras bearing a crucifix. He pleaded that the furniture objected to was in use before his time; and therefore no innovation of his; that the form of the credentia he received from Bishop Andrews; and that a reasonable use of figured hangings was approved by the Lutherans, and, as he had shown, by Calvin himself. Altars existed previous to Popery in the Christian church: and after the reformation in the reign of Elizabeth, they who changed their position innovated; and he had already shown in the Star-chamber that there could be no Popery in railing them in.

In the attempt to defeat the force of this reasoning, it was stated, that the passage (1 Cor. ix. 13, 14), placed altars and

* The quotations from Eusebius and Parker support the archbishop's argument; and there is no proof that the feast of dedication mentioned in John, x. 22, was not an anniversary of the dedication performed by Ezra, vi. 16, 17.—“Ceremonies,” says Mr. Hume, “in a religious age, tend to mollify that fierce and gloomy spirit of devotion, to which the rude multitude are subject. Laud corrected the error of the first reformers, by reviving a few primitive ceremonies; and presented to the mind some sensible exterior observances, which recalled it from its abstractions. Thought relaxed itself in the contemplation of pictures, postures, vestments, buildings; and all the fine arts which minister to religion, thereby received encouragement.”

which he humbly conceived that praise would have been a juster recompence. Contrary to the in-

priests in opposition to the Lord's table; that the passage (Heb. xiii. 16), "we have an altar," alluded to Christ himself;—that our Lord celebrated the Sacrament at an ordinary table; and called it a supper, not a sacrifice: that although in § 1, Edw. VI. c. i. the communion table was denominated an altar, this statute was repealed in three years, and the word afterwards changed into table: that Bishop Williams had fully proved tables only to have been used for more than 250 years after Christ: that Sextus II. introduced altars, and that the council of Aix first directed them to be railed in. Altars stood anciently in the choir or middle part of both the Jewish and the early Christian churches: this has been shown by Bucer, Jewell, and other reformers; while Bede and Austin of Canterbury affirm the same to have been their original position in England. The word choir has its name from the company who surrounded the altar, in modum coronæ; so that it could not stand close to the wall. In ancient Liturgies they who stood *round about* the altar were prayed for: and Durandus orders bishops, in consecrating churches, to walk round the altar seven times. As to the injunctions of Elizabeth*, directing the communion table to be fixed in the spot where the

* Queen Elizabeth's Injunction as to the Tables of the Church.

Whereas in many parts of the realm the altars be removed, and tables placed for ministration of the holy Sacrament, according to law, and in other places the altars be not removed; in the order whereof, saving for an uniformity, there seemeth no matter of great moment, so that the Sacrament be duly and reverently ministered; yet for observation of one uniformity throughout the realm, and for better imitation of the law in that behalf, it is ordered that no altar be taken down, but by oversight of the curate and churchwardens; and that the holy table in every church be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered as thereto belongeth; and when the Sacrament is to be distributed, to be placed within the chancel, so that the minister

junctions of the civil law, he had been overwhelmed with 150 witnesses: and of these a large

altar stood; this, as it has been shown, was, anciently, in the choir, and indeed continued so throughout all the churches in England, until the time of Archbishop Laud. The Rubric in the prayer book and the eighty-second Canon of 1603, both order the tables into the body of the church. And as the saying of private masses brought this custom into the church of Rome, its introduction into England is evidently a Popish innovation.

With respect to the furniture of the altar, it was copied, no matter whether by Laud or Andrews, from the Pontifical of Aix, 1583; and, with the credentia and arras hangings representing the last supper, was condemned by the Homilies as well as by Elizabeth's injunctions.

In justice to the memory of him, who was, as usual, not permitted to answer, like St. Paul, for himself, let it be observed, that the managers, in representing communion tables to have stood universally in the body of the church, until their removal by Laud to the east end, were guilty of palpable self-contradiction. Both the injunctions of Elizabeth, and the 82d canon of 1603, to which they referred, speak of a REMOVAL of the table from its original position, for the more convenient solemnization of the Eucharist, on every occasion of a communion. The injunctions confine it, when removed, to the chancel: the canon of 1603 says, "either within the chancel or the church." Now as the injunctions direct the table to stand "in the place where the altar stood;" to be removed, though still retained within the chancel, on the approach of every communion; and, after that communion, to be replaced where it stood before, it is plain, 1st, That the altar did not may conveniently be heard, and the communicants communicate with him; after the communion done, from time to time the same holy table to be placed where it stood before.

number were sectaries and schismatics; while by the canon law no schismatic could be heard against his bishop.

then stand in the nave or body of the church, nor even within the chancel detached from the wall; otherwise the table, its substitute in place, would not require removal on each preparation for the Eucharist. But the canon of 1603 throws still greater light on the subject; for the intention of removing the table at a sacrament is there stated to be, that a greater number might communicate along with the priest. Now seeing rails were introduced by Archbishop Laud, subsequently to both the injunctions and the canons, how could greater numbers communicate by the removal of a table, otherwise than by exposing four sides of that table where only three were usually exposed? The table, then, the substitute in PLACE for the altar (which had before stood in the chancel)—the table, which the injunctions of Elizabeth commanded never to be removed from the chancel—the table, which, by the 82d canon of 1603, might indeed be removed, for a communion, to the body of the church, but was, after each communion, to be replaced within the chancel, stood usually in that chancel, with one side close to the wall; and to which side of the wall will not be long disputed by any who are at all conversant in ecclesiastical antiquities, or who attend to the words of the 82d canon of 1603 itself; where it is stated, that the Ten Commandments shall be set at the EAST end of the church.

It appears from the injunctions of Elizabeth, that the change of altars into tables, was by no means a change of place, but merely a reduction in height, an alteration of form, and an abstraction of the house for the pix, or tabernacle of the host, together with the flowers, the crucifix in relievo, and other superstitious appendages*.

On the whole, then, I conclude, that the managers, in hav-

* See Picart's Relig. Cerem. vol. i.

Upon the whole, it was clearly proved, on the religious part of the charge, 1st, That, with re-

ing asserted, that communion tables stood always in the body of the church, from the time of Elizabeth, until their removal to the east end of the chancel by Laud, advanced a glaring and self-exposing falsehood. The fact seems to have been, that after the canons of 1603 permitted the occasional removal of tables into the nave of the church, for the sake of convenience in communicating, lukewarm ministers, through negligence, and Puritan ministers through design, as well as encouraged by the connivance of Archbishop Abbott, very generally omitted their replacement after each sacrament, agreeably to Elizabeth's injunctions, in the east end of the chancel; and that Laud, whose leading passions were uniformity and strictness in ceremonies (especially where differences in these ceremonies marked and widened differences in the more essential matters of doctrine), did only his duty in exacting compliance with the injunctions, which many of the clergy had violated, and with the canons of 1603, whose indulgence they had abused.

A letter addressed by Laud to Brent, his vicar-general, directing the general removal of altars from the nave to the chancel, was introduced at the trial, but it contains not one syllable concerning their being placed "in the form of an altar, with their ends north and south." These terms of the charge were, altogether, the invention of the managers.

On the whole, if it be considered that the irreverent Scotch fashion of sitting round the communion table was now coming into vogue, and that, ever since the time of Parker, "some received the Eucharist sitting, others standing, others kneeling; some in the nave, and others in the chancel*;" we shall not have occasion to ascribe to popish motives the restoration of tables to the east end of the choir, and the fencing of them with railings from the approach of profaneness. Laud's love of uniformity, and desire to renew the solemnity of the

* See Strype's Life of Parker.

spect to the particular articles of accusation, the archbishop was, for the most part, in the right:

most solemn of all offices, will furnish a sufficient key to his conduct *.

With respect to the general reasoning of the managers on this head of the charge, it was no more than one string, from beginning to end, of false positions and impotent conclusions. In their dissertation on the difference betwixt an altar and a table, they were contending with objections of their own raising. Laud never attempted, never meant to restore ALTARS or the mass. As to the antiquity of the position of sacramental tables in the chancel †, Bingham has fully shown ‡, that an-

* Our rubric at this day leaves the position of the communion table indifferent.

† Bishop Williams's assertion, that the name of table only was in use for 250 years after Christ, is in direct contradiction to matter of fact. Ignatius ep. ad Philadel. calls the holy table, in each church, *αυθυσιαστηριον*; an expression which cannot signify Christ's body, for that is spoken of immediately before. The same name is given to the table by Irenæus and Origen. Tertullian calls it, *ara Dei et altare*. St. Cyprian, who died A.D. 258, uses the terms altar and table indiscriminately. As to the objection drawn from Origen, Min. Felix, Arnobius, and Lactantius (all of the third century), who affirm that Christians have neither temples nor altars; they must refer to heathen temples as the enclosures of an idol, and to Jewish and Pagan altars, where animals were offered in sacrifice; for all these writers speak of both churches and altars. They boasted of their *θυσιαστηρι*, and even sometimes a *βωμος*, though to this was ever added the epithet *αναιμακτος* (the bloodless altar). Nay, even to the word *τραπεζα*, table, when employed, tremendous or mystic is prefixed §. After all, however, in speaking of the ancient usage in this matter, it is not very fair to refer to the period antecedent to that interval of tranquillity betwixt the death of St. Cyprian, 258, and the tenth persecution, A.D. 303, during which, Eusebius says, that splendid churches were built; since, when the Christians were a people unprotected and oppressed, they must have been often satisfied with imperfect modes of service. It is of this period that Eusebius speaks, in describing the ancient churches as divided into three parts. ‡ Ecclesiast. Antiq. b. viii. ch. 5 and 6.

§ In the story of Marinus, in Eusebius, the name is *αγιασμα*.

2dly, That, even if he were censurable upon all the articles, he was not therefore guilty of an at-

cient churches were divided into three parts, the first being the narthex, or porch; the second the nave, *ναος*, or oratory; and the third, the bema, called also the chorus, or choir, which was inaccessible to the multitude, and hence called *adyta*; while from the rails, like net-work, or cancelli, which separated it from the nave, it derived the name of chancel. Now the ante-room, or narthex (from its oblong figure of a rod), was the place of catechumens, heretics, and penitents not restored to communion; the nave, where stood the ambo, or reading desk, contained all the faithful laity in communion of the church; while the clergy only were admitted to the bema, chancel, or *αγιον αγιων*, as the inner part is termed by Eusebius.

Now, the managers on Laud's trial affirmed, that the communion table in ancient churches stood in the nave or body; in proof of which, it was pretended, that the choir and nave were synonymous. The question then is, simply, Were they indeed so? In the 17th canon of the 4th council of Toledo, it is directed, that "Sacerdotes et levitæ (priests and deacons), ante altarem communicent, in chora clerus, extra chorum populus." Now the chorus here mentioned cannot be the nave, because the extra chorum would, in that case, be the ante-temple, or narthex; but in this place, extra chorum, the people were to communicate; and the narthex was the place of those who were not admitted to communion. This conclusion is corroborated by what Thodosius II. says of himself, namely, that he only made an oblation at the altar (the emperor alone being admitted within the chancel for that purpose), and immediately retired to the atrium, or court of the people. This, then, was the extra chorum, where the people communicated; and the chorus must, therefore, have been the chancel.

tempt to introduce Popery : and, 3dly, Though such an attempt could have been proved against

It is true that St. Austin has described the sacred mensa as in *medio* constituta ; and it was from this, and similar expressions in Bede and some other authors, that Bucer, Jewel, and other reformers, together with the managers for the Commons, inferred, that the communion table stood anciently in the middle or body of the church ; but, as we have already seen, that they failed to prove the choir to be the body of the church, it will be easy to shew, that in the present case they were not less widely mistaken.

In all the ancient churches, it is indisputable, that the communion table stood in the upper end of the chancel, but not close to the wall. The chancel terminated in a semicircular building called *apsis*, *exedra*, or *conchula bematis* ; and here the throne of the bishop, and the lower thrones of the presbyters, were ranged always **BEHIND** the altar : the throne of the bishop being by the Latins termed *cathedra*, or *sedes* ; from whence our names, cathedral and see*. This, it seems, was an imitation of the ancient synagogues, where, according to Maimonides, the law was placed against the wall, looking to the Holy Land, and in an arch on each side the elders were seated. The mensa in *medio* constituta, then, signified, **NOT** in the middle of the church, but in the middle of the chancel. And this explanation once admitted, all the learning of the managers displayed in their *modus coronæ*, and their bishops encircling the altars, and their people standing round about the altars, as introduced to prove the altar to have stood anciently in the body of the church, is but idle prattle wasted in the air.

As by the decree of Constantine, A. D. 333, many Pagan temples were converted into churches, the direction of the chancel was not, in all places, quite uniform. But to what

* Euseb. lib. x. ch. 4.

him, that it would not have amounted, by the law of the land, to treason.

point of the compass it usually looked, may be ascertained by considering what is said of the church of Antioch by Socrates (lib. v. c. 22), who flourished about 419. This church, says he, stood not LIKE OTHER CHURCHES, WITH THE *θυσιαστήριον* TOWARDS THE EAST.

Having been carried in this investigation further than I intended, I shall only detain the reader with two other remarks.

The injunctions of Elizabeth, for the taking away of altars, direct that the holy table should be set where the altar stood: that is, evidently, where that, recently taken away, had stood. But mark the chicanery of the managers, who, instead of this obvious explanation, first pronounced it to mean where the altar had ANCIENTLY stood, and then sought artfully to carry their point by a quibbling misrepresentation of the ancient custom.

But the managers were still more to be admired in affirming, that as private masses brought into the church of Rome the innovation of altars placed in the chancel (and this, by the way, is one non sequitur; for private masses might have been said in the body of the church, if the altar had, indeed, ever stood there), therefore this position of the communion-table in England must needs be a proof of popery: another non sequitur.

One word more respecting the furniture of the altar; the arras, the credentia, and the candlesticks. These were said to have been condemned by the 2d, 23d, and 25th of the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth. The 2d however only declares generally against the ABUSE of images; the 23d against monuments of FEIGNED miracles; and the 25th says nothing at all upon the subject. But in the 22d, the violation of laudable ceremonies is condemned; and the 35th forbids not the use, but the ABUSE of images, and representations not of miracles, but of FEIGNED miracles, in private houses. The whole are

In addition to the general injustice of his trial, he was treated by the judges with studied indig-

evidently pointed against saint worship, and image worship; not against the ornaments added to the altar by Laud*.

IV. It is now time to advert to the next grievance complained of; that of bowing at the name of Jesus, standing at the Gloria Patri, reading the 2d service at the communion table, and introducing copes and church music. Laud defended bowing, from (2 Chron. xxix. 29), "they bowed themselves and worshipped," and from Psalm, xcv. 6, "O, come let us worship and bow down," &c.—Bowing at the name of Jesus was in use in the time of Elizabeth, and is sanctioned both by her 12th injunction and by the 18th canon of 1603. "And shall I bow," said he, "to men in each house of Parliament, and not to my God, when I come to worship him in his house?" Bowing also to the altar, where it is said, "This is my body," is more proper than to the pulpit, where it is only said, "This is my word."

Copes are prescribed by the 24th canon of 1603; and music is fitting, as it elevates the heart to God.

But bowing, it was answered, favours the doctrine of transubstantiation: it was introduced by Pope Gregory X. and by the council of Basil, 1431. The canons of 1603 are not binding, since they were not confirmed by Parliament; and particularly since they are superseded by the homilies, prayer-book, articles, and book of ordination, none of which makes any mention of the practice. Standing at the Gloria Patri was brought in together with the mass (Cassander, p. 98). Reading the second service, where there is no communion, is contrary to the canons of 1571 and 1603, to the Queen's injunctions, the homilies, and the rubric; nor was it practised till very recently introduced into cathedrals, where a communion had been ordered every day in the year: but this being

* See Homilies.

nity. Exposed day after day to the gaze of the people; often waiting an hour or two among ser-

sometimes omitted, the second service supplied its place. The Lord's table, however, was designed only for the sacrament; the Epistle and Gospel for the reading desk. No mention is made of copes in the Common Prayer-book, or book of ordination; in the homilies, or the queen's injunctions: they are prohibited in the last prayer-book of Edward VI. and as to the twenty-fourth canon of 1603, it enjoined a cope to be worn only by the chief minister, and at the administration of the sacrament: but His Grace had enjoined all the clergy to wear copes, and at all times. Church music, by chanting, was introduced by Pope Vitalian, A.D. 666.

To this cluster of impudent mis-statements, the archbishop had, as usual, no permission to reply. He might otherwise have urged, that bowing at the name of Jesus is expressly enjoined in Rom. xiv. 11; and Philip. ii. 10: that in speaking concerning the Eucharist, "This is my body," if he was guilty of Popery, Scripture is guilty of Popery, Matt. xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. xi. 24: that to sit at the Gloria Patri, is not to "glorify God with the body," 1 Cor. vi. 20; and that the contrariety of reading the second service at the altar when there is no communion, to the canons of 1571 and 1603, is merely negative: since not one word, whether enjoining or prohibiting the practice, is mentioned in either *. With respect to copes,

* The same retort may be made to the assertions of the managers concerning bowing, and the wearing of copes. If the homilies, articles, liturgy, &c. make no mention of them: to make no mention, is not to prohibit them; nay, it is rather to acquiesce in the canons of 1603.

Both by the rubric in the Prayer-book of 5 and 6 Edw. VI. and the fourteenth canon of 1603, the Liturgy is to be read generally, where the people may best hear.

The object seems to have been, in this appointment, to exact the security of a profession of belief, the reading of the moral law, and uniformity in vestments, from Calvinistic preachers, who would not read the Liturgy.

vants in an ante-room, before he was summoned to the bar; brow-beaten and checked in the course

it will be proper to attend to dates. The stat. 2 Edw. VI. 1548, commanded all graduates to wear hoods. By the 5 and 6 Edw. VI. 1551, no cope or hood whatever was to be deemed necessary. Then came the 1 Eliz. c. 2, 1558, confirming the 2 Edward VI. which enjoined hoods. And the injunctions the following year, 1559, commanded all such vestments and square caps to be used, as were worn in the latter part of Edward VI.'s reign; which could not refer to that time, when no cope or hood was worn. Gibson's Codex, vol. i. p. 296. But further, in speaking of the canons of 1603, mention had been made only of the twenty-fourth, which relates exclusively to cathedrals; whereas the fifty-eighth expressly enjoins the wearing of surplices and hoods, by all the clergy, and in all churches. These same canons were urged as imperative, whenever they seemed of use to the managers: but when they favoured the archbishop, they had then no validity, having never been confirmed by Parliament. As to music, it was only alleged to be popish; but the forty-ninth injunction orders a continuance of provision for singing men and children: and likewise for the delight of those that delight in music, a hymn in the beginning or end of morning or evening prayers, in the best sort of melody that may conveniently be devised.

V. Laud was next accused of having advised the King to publish the Book of Sports, and of thereby suppressing afternoon lectures. He pleaded his having been authorized by the royal warrant: the use of certain Sabbath recreations even at Geneva: his personal reverence for the Sabbath, and the absurdity of asserting that the Book of Sports suppressed the afternoon lectures; seeing the allowed indulgences were not to commence until after the evening service. But the managers affirmed, that the warrant for printing the book was written with the archbishop's own hand; that Calvin disapproved of

of the proceedings, his towering spirit must doubtless have been sorely galled.

dancing and pastimes ; and that Laud played at bowls on the afternoon of the Sabbath. On this subject we have already delivered our sentiments at large, and shall only add, that whether Laud did well or ill, the fact substantiates not a charge of Popery.

VI. Another branch of the third general charge related to His Grace's encouragement of Arminian and Popish errors in doctrine. He had patronized Arminians alone since his accession to power in 1627 : he had obtained a prohibition of preaching on the five Calvinistic points, and he had punished in the High Commission Court several who had disobeyed the order. Laud denied having defended Arminianism, or promoted Arminians, exclusively : he wished that the dispute respecting the five points were carried on with better temper on both sides : the prohibition was the King's, and Arminian and Calvinistic trespassers had been punished indiscriminately. It is true, replied the Commons, that Downham and Taylor, with several other ORTHODOX, that is, Calvinist divines, have been promoted ; but this measure was only a blind to cover the advancement of the multitude of popishly-affected ministers. They challenged Laud to produce one Arminian whom he had punished.

Now here he might have answered, that to accept this challenge would only be to lead to an uncharitable construction, similar to that which had been applied to his promotion of Calvinists ; that, in 1632, however, Rainsford, an Arminian, having slighted the prohibition, was compelled to confess his error.

VII. Another charge preferred under the same head, relating to doctrine, was an alleged abuse of the freedom of the press, evinced in the refusal to license such orthodox books as the Geneva Bible, Fox's Martyrology, Jewell's works, Gillibrand's Almanack, and a History of the Gunpowder Treason. Laud

Yet in every part of the trial he defended himself with firmness and ability; insomuch, that even

had also mutilated books bearing hard on Arminianism and Popery; in the 5th of November service he had changed the words, "whose religion is rebellion, whose faith is faction, and whose practice is murder both of body and soul;" so as to give the altered passage a bearing against the Puritans; "who turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction." He had licensed other books, asserting the grossest dogmas of Arminianism and Popery; such as Cosin's Hours of Prayer, and Sale's Introduction to a Devout Life; while he had connived at the importation of popish books. "The decree for regulating the press," said he, "was an act of the council at large:" the Geneva Bible deserved suppression, for various obnoxious notes, and chiefly for that on Exod. i. 7, allowing disobedience to rulers: Gillibrand's Almanack omitted all the saints and apostles, to substitute the names in Fox's Martyrs; and as to this latter book, it was the abridgment only which was suppressed, lest it should injure the circulation of the larger work. He had deputed his chaplains to correct objectionable books, and was not to blame for errors of which he was not aware. He denied having connived at the importation of popish books.

The Commons now brought up their army of reserve. He procured, it seems, the decree for regulating the press, in order to enlarge his own jurisdiction: the Geneva Bible had been authorized by James, cum privilegio: Gillibrand's Almanack contained no offence, and Laud was bound to answer for his chaplains.

This might have been met, by urging, that the imported popish books which had been seized, were restored to the owners by the High Commission Court; that James condemned the Geneva Bible at Hampton Court; and that the remaining part of the defence had not been answered by assertions. In general, too, the answer in refusing licenses to violent books,

Prynne allows his pleading to have been full, gallant, and pithy, as the wit of man could invent ;

was fraught with good sense. " We are not now so angry with the Papists as we were formerly ; and, therefore, it is not expedient to exasperate their feelings, there being a design on foot to win them over by mild treatment."

VIII. The next charge was that of His Grace's having prosecuted Puritans, for preaching against Arminianism and Popery ; silencing the afternoon lecturers, and suppressing the design for buying up impropriations for their support. He answered that these were acts of the High Commission Court ; but that, in truth, he deemed that sentence just, as there had been too much preaching against laudable ceremonies, and in contrariety to the King's declaration. In like manner, the order for changing afternoon lectures into catechizing, had been issued previous to his time ; yet he approved of it, as the lecturers were factious persons, and every where created a breach between the pastor and his parishioners. As to the buying of impropriations, he thanked God that he had suppressed it. It was a plot against the church, and more ministers, had it succeeded, would have been dependant on these feoffees, than on the King and Lords spiritual and temporal. He, however, proceeded against these same feoffees by law ; and if the sentence was unjust, it was the judge's fault, not his.

The managers, in reply, flew off to the cases of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwicke ; and to the archbishop's determination neither to allow the Puritans to quit the kingdom, nor to remain in it in peace. They affirmed, that the act of a court imposes responsibility upon every individual who votes. If Laud did not draw up, he executed the instructions for suppressing afternoon sermons ; and levelled them against those who refused a living with cure of souls, or scrupled to wear the surplice and the hood. The impropriation lecturers were men licensed by the diocesans.

with art, vivacity, and oratory; and without the slightest acknowledgment of guilt.

The pleadings of the managers were here exceedingly weak; to shift ground is an acknowledgment of its untenableness. The Archbishop's defence was unanswered; and, we may add, what had all this to do with Popery?

We must not omit to notice a new trick of ingenuity here played off by the historian of the Puritans, in his account of this disgraceful trial. He had stated, in v. 2, p. 133, that the general charge of Popery was divided into two heads, relating to ceremonies and doctrine. Now the particulars already specified, only made against Laud, so far as they substantiated the general charge of Popery. But, conscious of their weakness in that sense and bearing, Mr. Neale, at v. 2, p. 154, declares that the *LAST* charge (as if there were a fourth general accusation) was that of a conspiracy to reconcile England to Rome. In fact, however, the introduction of idolatry, and the reconciliation of England to Rome, were classed together in the third general charge, and there was no other.

IX. The endeavour to reconcile the English and Romish churches was stated to have been evinced in the assumption of papal titles bestowed by the two universities; in discouraging the French and Dutch churches in England; in the acknowledgment of Rome to be a true church; and in forbidding the Queen's conversion to be prayed for. Laud here gave way to a vein of satirical poignancy. "I have converted several from Popery; I have framed an oath for abjuring it; I have made a canon against it; I have written a book against it; I have held a controversy against it; I have been twice offered a cardinal's cap, and refused it; I have been in danger of my life from a Popish plot; I have endeavoured to reconcile the Lutherans and the Calvinists; and, ergo, I have endeavoured to bring in Popery. As to particulars, the titles bestowed by the universities were trifles: let it be shown, that I assumed Po-

On one occasion, while he reflected on several of the witnesses, he was required to speak more

pish power. The Queen's conversion was prayed for in a factious manner, and in a spirit of bitterness. I do believe the church of Rome to be a true church. She never erred in fundamentals; for fundamentals are in the creed; and she denies it not. Were she not a true church, it were hard with the church of England; since from her the English bishops derive their apostolical succession. She is, therefore, a true, but not an orthodox church. People may be saved in her communion, and her religion and ours are one, in the great essentials. I am not bound to believe each detached phrase in the homilies; and I do not think they assert the Pope to be Antichrist; yet it is not in proof that I ever denied him to be so. As to the charge of unchurching foreign Protestants, I certainly said, generally, according to St. Jerome, "No bishop, no church;" and the preface to the book of ordination sets forth, that the three orders came from the Apostles. After all, what was my crime with respect to the French and Dutch churches in England? To insist that those alone of the second generation, born in this country, should receive the English Liturgy. I never had correspondence with Catholic priests; and it can be shown, that I informed the King of the late plot, as soon as I myself had intelligence of it."

To this spirited vindication, his adversaries lamely answered, that they never objected to him his attempts for the suppression of Popery; that the titles complained of were peculiar to Rome; that the Romish church is averred to be a false and unchristian one; having no true ministry, and no government of Christ's institution: that the reconciliation attempted, witness the ceremonies, was to carry England to Rome; and that, though Jerome said, *Ubi non est sacerdos, non est ecclesia*, bishop and presbyter were, by him, conceived to be identical.

respectfully of gentlemen, aldermen, and men of high condition. "That is nothing," was his haughty reply: "gentlemen, and men of all conditions, are separatists; and there is not a separatist in England, but his hand is against me."

Nicholas, one of the managers, honoured Laud with the title of pander to the whore of Babylon. It happened that one of this man's chief witnesses was a notorious procurer. "Good Master Nicholas," replied the archbishop, "pray do not dispense with all whores but the whore of Babylon."

No attention was paid to a pardon signed by the King; it being maintained that a pardon, before conviction, was invalid; and that the King could not pardon treason against the kingdom. In short, the cause of this prelate was manifestly prejudged; and his doom was sealed by constructive evidence, and unprincipled violence.

X. Beheading being, by way of indulgence, substituted for his intended punishment of hanging, Laud broke off his diary, and prepared for death.

This was a tirade of impotent malice. Assertions, without proofs, require no answer. Yet we cannot pass unnoticed the bold construction of the meaning of St. Jerome, who, in another part of his works, has the following remark: *Quid facit Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter, exceptâ ordinatione.*"

[I have deemed it proper to throw the articles of this charge into a note, lest its disproportionate length, if inserted in the main narrative, should seem prolix to common readers.]

He ascended the scaffold as if to gain a crown, not to lose a head: and his confidence was interpreted by friends to a pure, and by enemies to a seared conscience. It was difficult to ascertain which party was the more numerous, amidst the mingled moans and insults through which he passed. His address to the spectators commenced with that verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xii. 1, 2, "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus." He proclaimed his attachment to parliaments and Protestantism: but gloried in his refusal to forsake the temple of God, that he might follow the bleating of lambs in Dan and Bethel. Neither could he approve of that exorbitant authority, which the Parliament had lately arrogated. *Corruptio optimi est pessima*. He was not only the first archbishop, but the first man who had been deprived of life in England, by an ordinance of two thirds of the Legislature, unsanctioned by the Royal Signature. Not forgetful, even in death, of his master, he pronounced the King a true son of the church, while he compared that church to an oak cleft with wedges that have been taken from its own body. He wished to God that the Pope might not come in by the sectaries. Having denied the charge of treason, he betook himself to prayer: after which, the scaffold being greatly crowded, he desired to have room to die. At this moment an unfeeling and pragmatistical Puritan, Sir John

Clotworthy, thought fit to harass him with a theological dispute. Being asked by this rebel, what text was fit for a dying man, the archbishop replied, with dignity, "I desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ."—"There must be an assurance," said the controversialist, "on which to found that desire."—"That assurance is within," was the answer of the dying man. "But it is founded on a word," resumed his pertinacious opponent. "'Tis the word of God concerning Christ," said Laud, and turned haughtily away. After entreating God to give him patience to die for his honour, for the King's happiness, and for the church of England; to preserve the Sovereign in his just rights, and the Parliament in their ancient power, he recited the Lord's Prayer, and gave money to the executioner, desiring him to do his work in mercy. Then submitting his head to the fatal axe, he prayed with composure, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" and his head was severed at a blow *.

When we consider the celebrated controversy with Fisher, the Jesuit; the conspiracy of Con in 1640, by which this prelate was to be assassinated; the general prejudices of the times, in associating Arminianism with Popery; the repeated refusal of a cardinal's cap by Laud; the counte-

* Laud was at first interred in Allhallows, Barking; but, at the Restoration, 1666, removed to Oxford, and buried under the altar of St. John's College chapel.

nance given to suspicion by his introduction of ceremonies, and preservation of uniformity, in opposition to the Puritans; the canons of 1639, chiefly ordered by the archbishop, which were not less directed against Popery than against other errors; his defence of the ceremonies, as not Popish; his owning the subjection of the ecclesiastical to the monarchical power; his expression of sorrow, on the occasion of his impeachment, in hearing that he was suspected of professing Protestantism, and favouring Popery; his remarks on the letters patent for the palatinate, and those on Hall's Treatise concerning episcopacy, both of which look with an eye of jealousy towards Rome; his maintaining, at his trial, that he had recovered twenty Catholics; his calling in of Sale's work; and his declarations at that awful period, when none but the most abandoned lies; we are compelled to dismiss the High Churchman Laud, with a verdict of acquittal from the charge of Popery. To his Sovereign, the archbishop was a faithful servant; to the church of England, a steadfast well-wisher*. His intercourse with men was distinguished by little of that courtierlike manner,

* Even Neale, who accuses him of an ambition to be sovereign patriarch of the three kingdoms, admits that he was not an absolute Papist. And Bishop Hall's assertion, "We do not know where to find you," is, perhaps, his best vindication; stamping him, as one who held a middle way between both extremes in doctrine.

which conciliates enemies, and renders obnoxious measures palatable. Honest, sincere, and blunt, he rested, perhaps, too much, on the integrity of his heart and the justness of his cause. When his proud and pure virtue had once determined that an object was right, he advanced towards the attainment of it, a decided enemy to compliances; regardless of opinion; scorning to explain his conduct; despising half measures as the poor and ever-failing efforts of timidity to pacify opponents; and trusting that the soundness of his argument would alone carry him through in triumph. Yet when the encroaching spirit and ultimate aim of the Commons was either known or suspected, this high and haughty rectitude is more to be venerated, than the weak though well-meant concessions of Charles. As far as personal safety was at all concerned, neither line of conduct afforded security from the scaffold.

Laud lived in troubled times; and his vigorous mind opposed itself alike to Catholics, Puritans, and Socinians. He obtained a decree in the Star-chamber against importing schismatical books. By compelling the combination-lecturers to use the canonical prayer in the pulpit, and to read the communion service in hoods and surplices, he reduced the evil of the lectureships, and drove the more rigid Calvinists from the market-towns*.

* In the diary, we meet with this singular memorandum: "Guilty of a special sin with E. B.;" on which note Mr.

A man's private journal is a window to his soul. Laud kept a diary; and, according to the most entertaining of all writers, that man cannot be a bad regulator of his affairs, who casts up his receipts and expenses every night; and a soul either is, or seeks to be good, which enters into a daily scrutiny of her actions.

A desire of uniformity was the master-passion of Laud. He may have wished to reconcile England with Rome; but a mind framed like his must

Prynne has the charity to remark, that perchance His Grace was unclean with E. B. But every candid mind, whatever may have been his offence, will here perceive the chasteness and delicacy of his conscience; especially when it is added, that he kept a strict fast on the anniversary of this act of frailty.

Silks, satins, and other pompous dresses used by the clergy, were introduced by Wolsey, and retrenched by Laud. On his reproving a clergyman for his gay apparel, and showing the plainness of his own, "Your Lordship," replied the beau, "has better clothes at home, and I have worse." In preferment, Laud passed by incapable relatives, and promoted learned Arminians. The advancement of Hall, Usher, and some others, however, shows that he was not deaf to the claims of the opposite party. At the time of his death, he had projected many works of beauty in the church: but "the stroke of one axe hindered the working of many hammers." In a charge, he had noticed the dirtiness of English churches; and this gave rise to their being beautified. As Laud set the example by adorning St. Paul's, it was said, that "he pulled down Puritans and property, to advance Paul's and prerogative." A preacher at St. Peter's, Cornhill, at the time, attempted to show, that *diaconus* came from *χόμις*, *pulvis* *quas* *quasi*, working in dust.

soon have perceived that Rome will never be met half way ; that she will never surrender her supremacy and infallibility *. His grand object was to draw a broad line of demarcation betwixt the church and the fanatical sects, with an imitation of whose extravagances uniformity was incompatible. In this view, was he to blame in insisting on the ceremonies, or in dismissing ministers who had first accepted benefices, and then refused compliance with ordinances, which they previously knew to be enjoined by law ? Laud was deeply versed in polemical theology ; in luxury abstemious ; in munificence liberal ; in disposition severe and disinterested : “ A great man,” said even his enemy Wilde, though a leper. He was bountiful to the church, to his native city of Reading, and to his place of education, St. John’s College, in Oxford ; where the writer of these sheets, having, at the distance of 150 years, paced the same grounds, worshipped in the same chapel, studied in the same library, with this faithful servant of an unfortunate master, has often looked up to his portrait as to that of

* Neale and Hume, in their usual tone and spirit, give a curious account of the re-opening of the church of St. Catherine Cree, with much ceremony, by the archbishop.

“ Though, at the worst,” says Mr. Hume, “ his love of ceremonies was childish, the Puritans considered him as the forerunner of Antichrist.”

He had a plan for increasing poor vicarages. He added commendams to poor bishoprics. The Arabic lecture in Oxford is of Laud’s foundation.

a familiar friend ; and in the ardour of early and inexperienced life, sighed to be numbered with him among the ornaments of their common school. And why should a man be insensible to the voice of fame, if he studies to direct his ambition to useful ends, and prefers his Creator's glory to his own?

XI. The treaty of Uxbridge, Jan. 30th, 1645, was hopefully opened by a day of fasting ; during which a Mr. Love, determined, as it would seem, to conform his doctrine with his name, taught that the King's commissioners camethither full of blood, and that his hearers could entertain no hope of establishing peace with men, who hated their souls as well as their bodies, and who would drink in wine a health to their damnation. " There was some truth in what he said," observes the Puritan historian ; " yet these were unbecoming expressions in so nice a conjuncture." Had such expressions been used by a chaplain of the royal army, they would, with greater truth, have been pronounced most disgraceful to a Christian pulpit in ANY conjuncture. Of the three articles of discussion, the militia, Ireland, and religion, it only falls to our province to attend to the last. The King by his commissioners, agreed to the suspension of the penal laws against refusal of the ceremonies ; to the restriction of the bishops to their dioceses ; and to their preaching, unless disabled by ill health. He agreed that they should exercise no act of ju-

risdiction or ordination, without the consent of a council of presbyters, selected from their respective dioceses; and that other abuses in the church, relative to pluralities, non-residence, visitations, and ecclesiastical courts, should be rectified. He likewise was willing that 100,000*l.* should be levied from the lands of bishops, deans, and chapters, for the settlement of the public peace. But as he could neither in conscience nor in policy give up episcopacy, or consent to the entire alienation of the church patrimony; (seeing his coronation-oath bound him to the one, and the expedience of attaching the clergy to the crown dictated the preservation of the other;) as he could not meet the demands of the Westminster commissioners, who insisted on his taking the covenant, and assenting to all the consequences implied in that act; this attempt at accommodation proved abortive.

The royal commissioners having evinced so conciliatory a disposition, we are warranted in accusing Bishop Burnet of calumny, in affirming that the King suddenly broke off the treaty, elevated by the recent success of Montrose in Scotland. As to Neale's harsh remarks on the correspondence between Charles and the Queen *, it appears that she only besought him not to give up those who had ever stood his firmest friends; nor

* Rapin, p. 275.

ought compliance with the dictates of honour, religion, and humanity, in protecting the Catholics who had hazarded their lives and fortunes in his cause, to have been termed, “a senile attachment to the imperious dictates of his consort *.

Lord Clarendon is of opinion, that if the Parliament had obtained security, the matter of religion might have been accommodated at Uxbridge. But if we consider the strength of the Presbyterian and Independent parties in Parliament, and the necessity of retaining the Scots, who would be satisfied with nothing but the covenant: if we consider that the subject of the Catholics had not hitherto been touched upon; and that the Presbyterians would show them no mercy, while the King would never give them up; we shall rather subscribe to the belief, though not to the reasons, of Mr. Love, that peace was not to be expected.

XII. At this time the self-denying ordinance was passed, by which the Presbyterians unconsciously prepared the way for their own downfall. Fairfax and Cromwell now broke down the old regiments, and introduced a new model into the Parliamentary force. The Presbyterian chaplains, having preached up rebellion, availed themselves of this opportunity of returning to their snug benefices†; and no regular ministers being found to supply their place, the army was left to be in-

* Warburton, Remarks on Neale,

† Ibid.

flamed by a fanatical host of Independent lay preachers. Officers, and even privates, collected congregations in the open fields, and vented their wild absurdities in the churches adjacent to their quarters. From the military, this enthusiasm spread to their constant admirers, the fair sex; who, in defiance of the law of delicacy and decency, and of the apostolic declaration, that it is a shame for a woman to speak in the churches, allowed free efflux to that volubility of nonsense which they imagined to proceed from the workings of the spirit.

XIII. Although an army, wrought up to a pitch of frenzy by these declamations, carried, soon after, the victory of Naseby, the Parliament looked with terror on the career of so fanatical a body, and passed an ordinance for the suppression of lay preaching. A former ordinance directing the London presbyters to confer orders, was now revived, with the view of supplanting the military preachers: and an order was issued by the Parliament, for the settlement of a new discipline, to take place of episcopacy, which had been now for some time overthrown. This latter injunction was directed to the Westminster divines: and gave rise to warm debates, both in the Assembly and Parliament, concerning all the points in dispute among the several religious parties. An attention to their arguments will be more serviceable in disclosing their principles, than any statement of them offer-

ed in detail. The three points in dispute related to ordination, to synodical assemblies, and to church censures or the power of the keys. The Presbyterians began, in a singular contradiction, with asserting the power of ordination by divine right; at the same time recognizing the validity of all ordinations conferred according to the former usage of the English church. An objection was made by the Erastians to the claim of divine right. They were indifferent as to the form of government, and would submit to any that might be proposed by the state: yet they hinted, commenting on a passage in Timothy, that though elders might ordain elders, it did not follow that they could ordain bishops. The Independents set up a counter divine-right, in favour of election, previous to ordination, by each particular church. This occasioned a debate, in which Timothy, Titus, and Apollos, were cited as examples of pastors ordained without a previous call from a congregation. It was urged, that as the call of a flock was affirmed to constitute the pastor, and the authority of that pastor was denied extension beyond his flock, each new election of a minister to a different church must be attended with a new ordination: and again, since the church must, in all cases, precede the pastor, an Independent minister could not plant new churches. The congregationalists replied, that Timothy and Titus (they said nothing of Apollos) were extraordinary offi-

cers: that, in general, it was absurd to elect a man without his having a peculiar province for exertion; and that, though they did not deem reordination necessary on a new call, they could figure in their minds no strong objection to it. They agreed to imposition of hands, provided it conveyed no power of office. The Presbyterians carried the divine right in the assembly, the seven Independent divines entering a protest. On the question of synodical assemblies, the Presbyterians asserted that subordination is implied in the passage, Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17, where there is a reference, first to several witnesses, and afterwards to the church at large: and in Acts, xv. 2, where the church of Antioch confesses the superior jurisdiction of the church of Jerusalem. But the Independents replied, that a synod of presbyters is no where denominated a church; and that the reference of Antioch to Jerusalem was merely for advice, not for judicial determination. The first church of Jerusalem was assembled in one place, consisting only of 120 members, Acts, i. 15; ii. 1; iv. 6. The members of this church were all, with one accord, in Solomon's porch, Acts, v. 12. It was the whole multitude of the disciples called together, that chose the deacons, Acts, vi. 2, 5. At the return of Paul and Barnabas, the church was still in one place, Acts, xv. 4; and it was the Apostles, elders, and whole multitude, that sent these with other ministers to Antioch. From all

this it is inferred, that in the primitive church, the election of the congregation was the call to the ministry, and that no vestige of classes and synods can be traced *. As the Jewish Sanhedrim was proposed as a model for the presbytery, Lightfoot, and other Hebraists inclined to the Independent principle; observing that the judges of inferior courts went to Jerusalem only for advice, and were not subject to the control of the Sanhedrim. Selden, at the head of the Erastians, disapproving of all spiritual jurisdiction, expounded the passage, Deuter. xvii. 12, as signifying, that he who would not yield obedience to the priest, should die by the sentence of the judge, in opposition to the Presbyterian doctrine, that the priest held one court, and the judge another.

The Presbyterians carried this point in the Assembly. The Independents dissenting, complained of the neglect of their remonstrances; and still affirmed that the divine right of church government remained with each congregation. In the House of Commons, the Scotch commissioners, and the small party of their friends, were anxious to carry, by surprise, measures thus far successful; but the Erastians and Independents smoked this design, and Glyn speaking one hour, and Whitlock another, with studious prolixity against the *jus divinum*, the house was filled in the meantime, and the clause was accordingly lost.

* Lightfoot's Rem. p. 17.

The commissioners, sorely vexed, stirred up petitioners in their favour:—but every solicitation was disregarded; jealousy was sown between the Parliament and the city; and the high Presbyterian cause was ruined.

One last point remained for the discussion of the Assembly and Parliament: namely, excommunication, or what was termed the power of the keys. Here, as in the former instances, the Presbyterians had triumphed in the Assembly: but the Erastians and Independents uniting their forces, prepared for a trial of strength with them in Parliament. The Presbyterians affirmed, that the keys of the kingdom of heaven had been committed by Christ to officers of the church: and they consequently laid claim to the power of excommunication, not soliciting it as a boon from the favour of the legislature, but demanding it *jure divino*. The Independents claimed a like *jus divinum* for the whole brotherhood in each particular congregation; though without the sanction of civil penalties: while the Erastians insisted on laying the communion entirely open, and referring all crimes solely to the civil magistrate.

Selden exhibited his stores of theological knowledge, as chief advocate of the Erastian principles. He observed, that no law existed for 4000 years, suspending any persons from religious exercises. Pagans, it is true, were prohibited from eating the passover; but these were of a different religion:

the present question related to excluding Protestants from the communion. No man ought to be banished from it by sin; all are sinners more or less: and public sins ought not to be more the objects of human punishment than private ones. The Dic Ecclesiæ in St. Matthew related to the courts of law, at that time sitting in Jerusalem. Excommunication was first introduced, 200 years after Christ, by Popes Victor and Zephorinus, as an auxiliary in their private quarrels. Whitlock, on the same side, took a different view of the subject. "The power of excommunication," said he, "is to be vested in every parish, in the hands of a pastor and several ruling elders. Now the office of a pastor is to feed his sheep: but the exercise of this power is to exclude them from food. 'Drink ye all of the cup,' said Christ to his Apostles, though Judas the traitor was at that time one of the company. As to the eating and drinking unworthily, it is the unworthiness, not the eating and drinking, which condemns; and the judgment of this is not in the minister, but in the sinner himself. But with these pastors it was proposed that ruling elders should be conjoined in the church government of every parish. Now elders amongst the ancient Jews signified men of the chief power and dignity; hence also, in several countries, senators, aldermen, seigniors. But the power of excommunication is exceedingly great; and it is doubtful whether, in obscure parishes, age

alone would confer a competent measure of judgment for its exercise. The two grounds of exclusion would be ignorance and scandalous offences. But it was possible that what would be pronounced ignorance or scandal in one parish, might be held as no ground of exclusion in another. Besides, why cut men off from communion? they ought to be the rather retained and improved. A man may be a good physician who never amputates a limb. Here, in short, you are about to raise up an ecclesiastical judicatory in every parish, when all the while the civil power is amply sufficient to correct the evil*."

* It may be expedient in a state to keep ecclesiastics in check, by granting an appeal to the civil tribunals. But the Erastian argument denied the propriety of vesting any power of church censure in the hands of the clergy; and indeed, it would appear, even of the civil powers. Their arguments however were quibbling and inconclusive. How would they surmount or explain the Anathema-Maranatha, of 1 Cor. xvi. 22; or the order to deliver the incestuous person unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord, 1 Cor. v. 5; or the—"let him be unto you as a heathen man and a publican," of Matt. xviii. 17; or the—"have no company with the disorderly," of 2 Thess. iii. 6—14? That all men are sinners, is true: but Selden forgot the distinction betwixt habitual, scandalous, deliberate, presumptuous, unrepented sins; and trespasses of surprise and infirmity, not causing offence to the community, deeply deplored, and earnestly struggled with.

To Whitlock it might be replied, that various circumstances in the offence of Judas render it no fair criterion; that guilt is certainly unworthiness, yet is aggravated by the daring tri-

These two speeches, though in many parts more ingenious than solid, left a strong impression upon the Commons. Yet as a popular outcry had been made, complaining that ministers possessed no power of excluding unworthy communicants from the sacred table, an ordinance, not wholly abolishing but regulating the power of excommunication, was passed October 1645. By allowing an appeal upwards from the presbytery to the classes, to the synod, to the national assembly, and finally to the Parliament, it in fact stripped the church of the power of the keys*.

With this decree the high Presbyterians were

fling of thoughtlessness, ignorance, or presumption, with a solemn mystery; that arguments from analogy are always to be distrusted; and that here, a limb cut off for the sake of the body, has no relation to a member excluded for his own sake, and with a view to his restoration.

That a bishop, or at least a person to whom episcopal power is delegated, is the proper judge in matters of excommunication, is proved by Potter, ch. 85, § 8; Whitgift's Defence, Tract 18; and Field of the Church, b. i. c. 15.—See the preliminary chapter to this volume.

* Other clauses expressed an equal jealousy of the presbyteries. Capital offences were reserved for the cognizance of the civil magistrate; who might certify the commitment of an offender to the presbytery; after which these possessed a power of suspending him. The elderships were not to have authority in matters of property. Secrets of confession were not to be used as evidence in law: and a standing committee of members of Parliament, being also members of the Assembly, were appointed to take other offences into consideration.

dissatisfied. They declaimed both from the press and pulpit against the ultimate appeal to Parliament, as striking at the root of the true Presbyterian discipline. But the Parliament, in which Erastians, Independents, and moderate Presbyterians prevailed, instead of indulging this design to render the church independent on the state, added new power to the latter by interposing between themselves and the national assembly an intermediate tribunal of appeal, which consisted of commissioners whom Parliament should delegate in each province; and to whom in most cases the minister was to be compelled to certify any suspension.

1646. These edicts, in which mention is made of classes and synods, were issued several months prior to any such distributions of the national clergy. At length, in March 1646, an ordinance was finally passed for regulating each parish by a presbytery, composed of the minister and ruling elders. These parochial presbyteries were to be formed into classes: and each class was to depute representatives to the provincial assembly; which in its turn should contribute by delegation to the forming of the national council*. Thus was Presbyterianism made the established religion of England; although, as an appeal was open from all these tribunals to the Parliament, it was settled

* From this rule the domestic chapels of the King and Lords were exempt.

on Erastian principles. This rule, however, was never completely established. According to Mr. Eachard, the Presbyterians never saw their dear presbytery fully settled in any part of England: but Mr. Baxter—"look where it comes again"—Mr. Baxter, who was much better acquainted with the fact, affirms that there was a provincial assembly both in London and Lancashire.

With this half-measure all parties were dissatisfied. The Assembly divines, the Scots and English commissioners, and the high Presbyterians, raised their united voices against the discipline as imperfect. The Independents and Episcopalians were excluded from toleration; and the people at large were exasperated by finding a Presbyterian hierarchy established in every parish, and assuming a civil as well as ecclesiastical supremacy over consciences*.

* An ordinance was passed for abolishing the names and offices of bishops, and applying their revenues to the payment of the public debt. Thus the Presbyterian sharks were disappointed. They however indemnified themselves by evading the act for granting to the wife and children of every sequestered minister, the fifth part of the value of his benefice. If these were children who had lost their mother, they refused the subsistence, as the case came not within the letter of the ordinance. Equally pharisaical were they when there was a wife with one child; as if one child could live on nothing any more than several. The bishops were now stripped even of those pittance which they had hitherto enjoyed as salaries: insomuch that, in the following year, Prideaux Bishop of Worcester, being requested by Charles to be present at the treaty

XIV. 1646. At this juncture, the royal cause having become desperate, Charles had thrown himself into the hands of the Scotch army at Newark, May 5, 1646. Petitions against the mutilated Presbyterian government recently established, were presented to the Parliament by the Westminster divines, and by the General Assembly of Scotland. Determined not to resign the ecclesiastical supremacy, yet fearful of offending the Scots, who had a powerful army in the north, and possessed so rich a prize as royalty, the Commons, in order to gain time till they should see whether it were practicable to accommodate matters with the King, proposed to the Assembly a string of queries relative to the *jus divinum* of church-government, in the hope of dividing, or at least, for some time employing that body of aspiring ecclesiastics. Agreeably to their design, in the committee appointed by the divines, the Erastians first created a division, then debated the question for the space of three months, and at length withdrew themselves, as the Independents had done at the first. The report, which was only the resolution of a few high Presbyterians, asserted that Jesus Christ has appointed a church-government distinct from the power of the civil magistrate*.

of the Isle of Wight, had not money sufficient to pay his expenses; and on that account did not attend.

* From this report Lightfoot alone dissented.—Colman

Nothing can parallel the folly displayed by the Parliament at this important crisis. Now was the time for their securing themselves, by making terms with his Majesty, or of coming to some agreement with the Independents, whom they knew to be so powerful in their own army. But by their wild obstinacy in rejecting the just and moderate claims of toleration preferred by that body, and in maintaining the uniformity of the covenant, they prepared their own destruction*.

was now dead.—In the mean time the city divines had taken up the argument, and published their Divine Right of the Presbytery: but the Parliament brought them to moderation.

* See end of this chapter.

While the question of toleration was pending between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the city divines, wise heads! petitioned the Assembly from Sion College, against the great Diana of the Independents. This petition was seconded by an imperious demand from Scotland, that there should be no toleration of sectaries, and no liberty of conscience. Such were the sentiments at that time openly avowed, that, according to one writer, to grant men the indulgence of serving God according to their consciences, was to have cast out one devil in order to admit seven worse. In the mean time the royalists stirred up counter-petitioners for liberty in the city and parliamentary army, with the view of dividing the friends of the opposite cause. Taking advantage of these differences, the King too, at the same time, made overtures to Goodwyn and Nye; but these congregationalists put a stop to the correspondence.

Either they were determined republicans, which is an improbable supposition; or distrusted the royal word, which has been affirmed; or sought to carry their point by obtaining

XV. The Scottish army, desirous to return home with their spoil, carried the King northward from Newark to Newcastle, where they treated him with ceremonious respect. He was not, however, here exempt from the perverted theology and the vile taste of canting sermons. After one of these harangues from the appropriate text of 2 Sam. xix. 41—43, in which the Scots were made to denominate themselves the men of Judah, who had ten parts in the King, he found that all their pledges of loyalty presupposed the condition of his taking their darling covenant. Two doubts, he stated, occasioned his reluctance to this measure; namely, whether episcopacy were not to be supported as *jure divino*; and whether his coronation-oath, which engaged him to support the established religion, could lawfully be violated. As he professed himself willing to discuss these two questions, and open to conviction, Henderson, a learned divine, and head of the Presbyterian party, arrived from Scotland, to banish the royal scruples. With this antagonist Charles entered into a controversy in writing (May 29, 1646), which may be considered as exhibiting the marrow of the arguments employed at this period by the two contending parties. The King,

separate communion, on principles of rational liberty openly recognised. To this last opinion I have the charity to subscribe. They petitioned for the Baptists, as well as for themselves.

after alluding to his scruples already mentioned, demanded what warrant could be produced from Scripture for subjects forcing the conscience of the King. The Scotch divine answered, that the reformation of Henry VIII. was defective, by transferring the supremacy from one wrong head to another: and, like a bold rebel, threatened the King with the terrible denunciation (Esther, iv. 14), “For if thou altogether hold thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father’s house shall be destroyed: and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?”

He denied the apostolical institution of episcopacy, asserting the primitive identity of bishop and presbyter. There appears, said he, a beautiful superiority in degree, but not in order, in the New Testament; as no Evangelist is above another, so no presbyter is above another*. Many Episcopalians supposed that presbyters might ordain presbyters. King James had never asserted episcopacy by divine right. He entered a caveat against arguing from the usage of the primitive church; since Scripture was the only infallible rule. Even in the days of the Apostles, Diotrephes sought to have the preeminence, and the mystery of iniquity began to work. Was there no difference in

* A sophism: supposing the King to have granted that bishop and presbyter were the same.

the effect of baptism performed by a midwife, and by a minister, though ordained by presbyters? It was idle to plead the coronation-oath, since from any clause the party to be benefited by it might give release.

In a few days the King delivered in a second paper. No text, he maintained, could sanction a reformation unless under royal authority. That of Henry VIII. was improved by Edward and Elizabeth. Presbyters could not ordain presbyters: the Presbyterian discipline was never established before the time of Calvin; and he would undertake to prove the apostolical institution, the succession, and the consequent necessity of episcopacy, if the aid of books, or of learned divines, were allowed him. To solve doubtful passages, primitive usage might be called in; otherwise each private spirit would be the interpreter of Scripture; which would contradict 2 Peter, i. 10, and introduce all confusion. Diotrephes afforded no case in point. He openly opposed St. John. Baptism administered by a woman, might, when administered, take effect; but could not be allowed to be regular: and in regard to the other sacrament, since a lawful minister was necessary, the question of episcopacy was of the utmost importance. On the subject of the coronation-oath, Henderson might be met on his own grounds; for the party benefited by the religious clause, was in fact the church of England: when the church of England therefore should release

their sovereign from that clause in the oath, then, but not till then, should he think himself at liberty. In the English reformation, Parliament had only given a civil sanction to the ecclesiastical regulations established by the King and clergy.

Henderson replied, that if the King neglected reform, the power fell to inferior magistrates, and, on their neglect, to the people. The *jus divinum* of episcopacy was never pleaded till lately: formerly bishops were content to act under the authority of princes*. To the question, Where was presbyterianism before Calvin? he would return the same answer as the Protestants gave to the Papists, when it was asked, Where was your church before Luther?—In Scripture †. The first church of Jerusalem contained more churches than one, and was governed by a presbytery (Acts, xv.), where the Apostles sate as elders‡. Such was the

* If Henderson meant, that Erastianism had always prevailed till lately, all history contradicts his words. If he meant, that Episcopalians, maintaining the *jus divinum* of episcopacy, denied the authority of princes in ecclesiastical matters, he calumniated episcopacy, or did not understand it. The *jus divinum* of episcopacy was, in this respect, different from the *jus divinum* of the presbytery.

† The cases were widely different. The promises of Christ's perpetual presence with his church, imply a perpetual existence of that church. Now episcopacy had always existed amidst the corruptions of Rome: but where had presbyterianism existed?

‡ Both these positions the Independents denied; and the latter was disproved by the Episcopalians.

government at Ephesus, Corinth, Thessalonica; and when at length one presbyter presided with the name of bishop, Jerome declared it was by custom rather than by divine appointment*. That presbyters may ordain is apparent from 1 Tim. iv. 14; "The laying on of hands of the presbytery." Even if bishops and presbyters exercised distinct functions, the force of the presbyters' character does not on that account flow from episcopal ordination; for the seventy were inferior to the Apostles, and yet received their commission, not from them, but from Christ†. Though Jerome admits a difference of functions in his time, he states, that bishops and presbyters were the same in the days of the Apostles‡. As to the coronation-oath, if the clergy were to be first consulted, could a reformation ever be expected in Rome? The King was bound to attend to the good of the whole, and not exclusively to the good of the clergy: *Salus populi suprema lex*. It had been asked, "Could the King's conscience be forced§?" He replied, "If it were amiss, it ought to be rec-

* *Quid facit episcopus quod, not facit presbyter, excepta ordinatione.*—Jerome.

† During the lifetime of Christ, he was the sole bishop: the Apostles corresponded to priests, and the seventy to deacons. Was it ever pretended that presbyters could ordain deacons?

‡ This is poor quibbling. The names might be the same, and the orders different.

§ This was making a king the only one in the realm who was not to judge of his own conscience.

tified." He disclaimed the supremacy now assumed in the state, and recently by the Prince, of receiving appeals from the highest ecclesiastical judicatory.

Charles, in his third paper, affirmed, that the rebellion and punishment of Korah (Numb. xvi.), proved the reforming power not to rest with the people. He denied that the early reformers held church-government, as it respected episcopacy, to be mutable. Bishops and presbyters do not *always* mean the same office in Scripture; and if they did, that was only during the time of the Apostles, whose successors were styled bishops*. As to the many congregations in Jerusalem under one church, this might be an argument against the Independents, but it was nothing to him. Were not many parishes contained in one diocese? In like manner, it was nothing that the Apostles conferred with other ministers. Do not deans and chapters assist a bishop? As to Jerome, he was angry with those who maintained a parity between

* The word Apostle is of the same import nearly as Missionary. Now suppose the first bishop of Calcutta were to be termed by the commonalty (which is not unlikely), the missionary; and suppose he were to lay his hands upon a presbyter, who should afterwards succeed him, and, as the episcopal government became better understood, should receive *always* the title of bishop; would it not have some faint colour of probability, if, a hundred years hence, some disputant were to pretend that episcopacy in India was only of the second generation?

deacons and priests ; and his argument led him to elevate the priestly character *. It is evident that St. Paul had a share in the ordination of Timothy. The King persisted in affirming, that the clergy must release him from his coronation-oath ; and as to the clergy not being likely to consent to their own reformation, *incommodum non solvit argumentum*. He presumed not to censure foreign churches : necessity may, perhaps, excuse what in general would be unlawful : but he esteemed that church most which came nearest to the primitive model. According to Austin : “ *Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec a concilio institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi apostolica auctoritate traditum rectissime creditur.*”

On the other hand, the Scottish divine contended, that the primitive fathers contradict each other on the subject of episcopacy. To take Scripture and antiquity together, as the Catholics do, is a less dangerous error than to take antiquity as the expounder of Scripture ; for thus is our faith not in the word of God, but in the wisdom of men ; and thus, as Tertullian says, “ *Nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non erit.*” Again, Scripture ought only to be interpreted by Scripture, as was done under Nehemiah (Neh. viii. 8), and others †. Antiquity has been the parent of

* Still, however, keeping it under the episcopal.—Vide *supra*.

† Nehemiah, viii. 8, is nothing to the purpose ; and rather

some errors ; as, for example, of liturgies, of the cross in baptism, of free-will, which began with Justin Martyr, and, with the exception of St. Austin, descended to the Reformation. The earliest ages were not the purest.

The King in his last answer expressed a reverence for Scripture ; and admitted, that parallel passages were the best interpreters of doubtful texts ; but urged, that when these were not explicit, and the text remains doubtful, there must needs be an umpire, a standard of appeal ; and he knew no standard more respectable than primitive practice, and the judgment of the early fathers. To impute sudden and universal defection to the primitive church, is a boldness which ought to have positive proofs on its side. It is not enough to affirm, that some rites were not practised ; it must be proved that they were pronounced positively unlawful by the Apostles*.

After narrating this controversy with a prolixity of accurate detail, Collier breaks out into a passage of bold, nervous simplicity, which, as it affords a very favourable specimen of his manner of writing, I shall here transcribe exactly as it

makes against Henderson's argument. "The priests read the Scriptures, and caused the people to understand the meaning."

* Bishop Kennet and Mr. Eachard have produced a formal recantation, said to have been made by Henderson on his death-bed. The General Assembly of Scotland asserted its falsehood.

stands (vol. ii. p. 848): " Thus I have reported the substance of the debate, and on which side the victory lies shall be left to the reader. By his Majesty's MANNER, one would almost have thought he had lain under no mortification; that the rebellion had been crushed; and that his affairs had been in the easiest posture imaginable. He discovers no mark of dejection or disturbance. He lays down solid principles; looks through Henderson's discourse with great penetration, attacks him in his main strength, and argues with force and perspicuity, and all this without being furnished with common convenience, without books or divines to assist him: besides, his Majesty engaged no ordinary champion, for, to give Henderson his due, he was a person of learning, elocution, and judgment, made the best of his way, and seems to have been the top of his party. It is credibly reported*, that Henderson's being worsted in the controversy, threw him into a deep melancholy, which ended in a mortal distemper. Some say he died a convert to his Majesty, and that he did him the justice of an extraordinary character, in managing a debate of this nature. The English commissioners being informed how well his Majesty had acquitted himself against Henderson, declined engaging in any dispute, and only desired his answer to their propositions; but these were

* Heylin, Hist. Presb. p. 477. Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ, p. 309.

so unreasonable, the King could give them no satisfaction."

XVI. In the mean time new proposals of agreement were presented to Charles by the Parliament. But when we state, that the terms were his taking the covenant and sanctioning the Directory, educating all children of Papists as Protestants, exempting from pardon all Papists who had served in the army, with all members of Parliament who had joined the royal standard, and rendering ecclesiastics who had joined him incapable of preferment, (what becomes of Mr. Neale's account of the restoration of their livings on a pacification?) we need not wonder that Charles turned a deaf ear to the friends who advised him to treat, and replied, that his conscience was dearer to him than his crown.

XVII. 1647. The Scottish army, after having promised to the French ambassador, to receive and protect the King on his surrender of himself into their hands, now basely sold him for 200,000*l.* of arrears*. Neale states, that Charles, being removed, agreeably to his own wish, was left at Holmby, in Northamptonshire, for the convenience of readier conference with the Parliament; and that the simultaneous receipt of the arrears was matter of accident. But would the English have paid the arrears without receiving the King;

* It was to procure this sum that the episcopal lands were alienated,

or the Scots parted with their prize without obtaining the arrears †?

XVIII. In his new prison, the King was insulted with the compliment of two parliamentary divines; but he refused to attend their preaching on the Sundays, and would not even permit their saying grace at his table. The Presbyterians, seeing every thing quiet, proposed a reduction of the military force. Their pretence was to lighten the pressure of public burdens; but they really aimed a blow at their sectarian adversaries, who, they knew, predominated in the army. In the mean time, resting on their own strength in Parliament, they were obstinate in refusing toleration to any other religious party. The independent and fanatical army, however, had no inclination to be disbanded: they were not mercenary soldiers, they declared, but patriots, who had taken up arms in the cause of liberty of conscience, and would not lay them down till that end should be attained. A military parliament was formed by a council of officers, to represent the peers; while an inferior house composed of two privates, as agitators, was chosen from each company. The Parliament of Westminster, apprehensive of this mutinous spirit, renewed their treaty with the King, on the basis proposed at Newcastle; that of his settling Presbyterianism for three years, yielding up the

† Warburton.

militia for ten, and consenting to act against the Papists. The army were now in despair; and the seizure of the King by Joyce, with his removal to head-quarters at Newmarket, became a measure necessary to their security. Both before and after the seizure, they attempted to treat with his Majesty, proposing to reinstate him on his throne, and demanding no return but toleration. Whether they were serious in their offer is a different question. Neale speaks of this host of fanatics as of a body of reasoning men, whose violence was the offspring of despair, and who had not, at first, the slightest intention of deposing and murdering the King—not they; although Peters, Cromwell's chaplain, and other desperate enthusiasts, were fond of preaching on the text (Psalm cxlix. 6—8), “*to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron. This honour have all the saints;*” and although soon after, some of the military pastors changed the phrase in the Lord's Prayer, “Thy kingdom come,” into, “Thy commonwealth come.” Being in possession of the prize, they rose in their tone of demand; and the more effectually to hasten the downfall of their oppressors, they attempted to conciliate the favour of Charles with promises and gentle treatment, principally by allowing him to use the Liturgy, to be attended by four chaplains, and to hold intercourse with his children; all which indulgences the Presbyterians had denied him. The King, however, distrusted these specious

overtures, both of the Parliament and the army. He still fondly clung to the vain imagination that his own party was strong enough to obtain the ascendant.

XIX. The army carried Charles along with them in all their marches, and settled him, in August 1647, at Hampton Court, where he remained three months, enjoying the splendour of royalty. At length Cromwell, whose ambitious views began to open, terrified him with an account of the menaces alleged to be aimed by the agitators against his life, and thus urged him to attempt an escape from the palace. The wily leader availed himself of this device as an excuse for confining him more securely; having been fearful lest to adopt that measure directly should awaken the slumbering loyalty of the nation. Charles was shut up in Carisbrook Castle in the Isle of Wight (November 1647), during nearly a year, without more than one or two servants*.

Cromwell having now, to use his own expression, "the King in his hand, and the Parliament in his pocket," suppressed the agitators and levelers of the army. Their visions of a republic, in

* See Herbert's Last Days of Charles I.—In this retirement the sacred Scriptures were the book he most delighted in; but he read often in Bishop Andrews's Sermons, Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Dr. Hammond's Works, Villalpandus upon Ezekiel, Sandys's Paraphrase upon King David's Psalms, Herbert's Divine Poems, &c.

which the elect should enjoy perfect parity, and the meanest centinel, if enlightened by the Spirit, should be equally entitled to regard with the highest commander, though disregarded while it was expedient to obstruct the measures of Parliament, were not consonant to military subordination, and much less to those schemes of absolute power which the deep dissembler was hatching. Yet aware, that while the monarch lived, insurrections would be attempted in his favour, and averse from the odium which would follow private assassination, he obtained a determination in a council of officers at Windsor, that his prisoner should be removed with an appearance of justice.

XX. Accordingly, when Charles rejected the exorbitant demands of the Parliament, the republican party, instigated by Cromwell and Ireton, decreed, that no addresses should in future be sent to the King. Hitherto he had been mentioned by many with some respect; he was now treated as a criminal hardened in heart, and marked out for destruction. Thus was the cord with which he was tied to the stake, shortening every day. In the mean time the army and the Parliament were contending whether presbytery should be with or without a toleration.

XXI. 1648. The Scots, observing the sway of the Independents in the army and Parliament, and dissatisfied with the imperfect manner in which even the Presbyterians had established their cove-

nant, raised a force for the protection of the King. Joined by the Cavaliers, they formed an ill-united body; and were speedily defeated by Cromwell near Preston.

XXII. From August 1647 to May 1648, the Parliament was overawed in its proceedings by the army: but that body having removed to a distance from the city, the two houses found themselves set free from restraint. The Presbyterian party now regained the ascendant; and, rescinding the vote of non-addresses, sent fifteen commissioners to treat with Charles at Newport, in the Isle of Wight. Juxon, Duppa, Sheldon, Hammond, and other divines, together with several noblemen, gentlemen, and lawyers, were permitted to stand behind the chair of the Sovereign, and to hear the debates; but not to speak, except when the King, for consultation, withdrew with them into another apartment. Usher joined this party towards the latter part of the conference.

In this treaty, September 18, the King offered to resign the militia, to pay the public debts, to confirm the great seal of the Parliament, to allow that body to confer offices for twenty years, and, with respect to religion, he consented that Presbyterianism should be established for three years; after which period a council should deliberate as to future measures. He would banish Papists; he would abolish pluralities; he would strip the

bishops of their possessions; he would authorize the letting of the chapter-lands on leases; he would sanction the Directory; he would suppress the Liturgy. But he would not give up his friends as treasonable; he regarded the alienation of church-lands to be sacrilege; and although he would willingly reduce the hierarchy—although he would lessen the extent and increase the number of the dioceses—although, in short, he would execute the plan formerly proposed by Usher*, he could not relinquish his belief in the necessity of episcopal government. A learned debate ensued, relative to the divine right, or apostolical institution of episcopacy, in which all the old arguments were once more brought forward, and many new and ingeniqus reasonings advanced †. The King drew a distinction between bishops of the flock, and bishops of both flock and pastors. To teach, he said, was common to presbyters and bishops; to govern, peculiar to the latter. He challenged the commissioners to show, either that no form of church-government is prescribed in Scripture, or, if there be any, that the civil power may change it; or, if it be unchangeable, that it was not episcopacy. This, however, they declined; content-

* His objection to the disuse of the Liturgy was grounded on his unwillingness to worship where he knew not what the minister would say. And it was a weak answer to tell him, he knew the substance of it in the Directory.

† Neale, vol. ii. p. 344, &c.; Collier; Fuller.

ing themselves with a final reply, which Neale, to show his logic, must needs digest under the form of a syllogism. Whatsoever is not of divine institution may be done away ; but the episcopacy of England is not the episcopacy of Scripture ; therefore, that which the laws established, the laws may take away. This pompous setting forth might be answered in the true style of the schools: *Negatur minor*. Many persuasives were used to extort greater concessions from the King ; though all men but Mr. Neale might conceive that he had conceded enough. But with a steadfastness which demands the admiration of his bitterest enemies, he abided by his answers, and cast himself on the Saviour's goodness, to support and defend him from afflictions : though he would meet any extremity sooner than, on politic considerations, he would throw away his tranquillity of mind. On the breaking up of the treaty, Charles is reported to have said, " I am a captain who has well defended a castle, and I will defend it still, till I find my tomb under one of its stones." This conference appears to have been conducted, on both sides, with as much of respectful decency as of profound learning *. And it is difficult to reconcile this fact with Lord Clarendon's testimony concerning Spurstow and Jenkins, who, after telling Charles, that if he should not abolish episcopacy, he would certainly be damned, came, on the

* Clarend. p. 224 ; and Rushw. p. 1326.

restoration of his successor, according to the modesty of that race of people, to kiss his Majesty's hand*.

XXIII. A treaty in which no mention was made concerning liberty of conscience, excited the strong displeasure of the Independent army against both the contracting parties; and they resolved, at St. Albans, to assume the sovereign power, to set aside the covenant, to bring the King to justice, and, in fine, to establish a commonwealth. Neale, who relates this, pronounces these men, in the same breath, to have been high enthusiasts, but of UNBLEMISHED MORALS. They accordingly seized the King, the day after the conference was concluded, and carried him to Hurst Castle, from whence he was removed to Hampton Court. They, at the same time, presented a remonstrance to the two houses, demanding justice on the royal head. The Parliament vote the impeachment of the principal remonstrants. The army travels to London. The Commons vote the King's late concessions to be the ground of a treaty. Then follows Colonel Pride's purge of the House of Commons, by which entrance is denied to the disaffected members. The hundred and fifty remaining are either officers or friends, who vote the concessions of the

* How loose is casuistry when interest is in one scale! The church-lands were for the support of certain offices: true, said the commissioners; but abolish these offices, and the lands naturally fall to the crown. Here there is no sacrilege. Q no!

Isle of Wight dissatisfactory, and resolve to try the King. The Lords reject the vote. The Commons vote themselves to be the supreme power, and the consent of the Peers to be unnecessary. They fasten a padlock on the upper house, and pursue their nefarious purpose of regicide. To this sanguinary measure they proceed in stern defiance of protestations presented by Gauden and Hammond—of a pamphlet written by Prinne, a secluded member—of petitions from Presbyterian ministers—from the Scots Kirk—from foreign ambassadors, and even from Independent ministers.—In the trial and execution of the King, fanaticism consummated its enormities. On Sunday, 28th January 1649, Juxon preached to him at St. James's, from the text Rom. ii. 16; and on Tuesday 30th, in the morning, he walked quite through the Park to Whitehall. At the north end of this building his persecutions came to a close. His head was laid on the block, and he suffered with magnanimity and meekness.

XXIV. All characters of this monarch will naturally receive their colour from the political or religious views of the writers. An unruffled equanimity in all changes of fortune seems, however, universally allowed to have been the distinguishing feature of his mind. It was his misfortune, and ultimately occasioned his ruin, that, distrustful of his own opinion, he suffered himself to be influenced by others less judicious than himself. Yet it seems not surprising that, in the

unusual situation into which he was brought, he should support himself by the judgment of others, in matters for which history afforded no precedent. To transmit unimpaired to posterity the prerogative of the sovereign, powerful as he had been led by education to conceive it, he deemed an obligation of conscience; and it ought never to be forgotten in an estimate of his character, that the limits of that prerogative, and the rights of the subjects, had not in that age been accurately defined. His enemies have preferred against him a charge of inclination towards Popery. But his religion was warmly Protestant; and all his popery consisted in the humanity of his disposition, inclined to grant some indulgences to his Catholic subjects. A few days* after this King's decapitation, a book was published, entitled *Icon Basilike*, and by report assigned to him as the author. It ran through fifty editions in the course of one

* Report having, in 1643, accused the King of Popery, he made a public declaration of his protestantism at Christ's Church, Oxford, before receiving the sacrament at Easter. When the overbearing proposals were offered to him at Newcastle, 1646, Neale admits that both his Queen and the King of France twice pressed him to satisfy the Parliament as to the point of religion: but such was his attachment to episcopacy, and to his friends, that he flew into a passion on the first application, and on the second refused to see Sir W. Davenant the messenger. What then becomes of all this writer's tirades, repeated throughout 600 quarto pages, on the Queen's Popish influence, and the King's *senile* attachment to her Popish suggestions?

year ; and though some have doubted its being the production of Charles, no argument has been adduced, sufficient to impeach its authenticity. Milton compares its effects to those of the speech of Anthony, when he read the will of Cæsar*.

* It contains a prayer, p. 263, in which he expresses his penitence for having sanctioned the exclusion of the bishops from Parliament, the shedding of Strafford's innocent blood, and the extirpation of the hierarchy in Scotland.

So heavily indeed did the death of Strafford, and the surrender of the cause of episcopacy, weigh upon his conscience, that he resolved in the Isle of Wight, on walking, by way of penance, barefooted from Whitehall to the Tower.

See Toland's *Amyntor* on the one side, and Wagstaff's *Vindication of the royal Martyr* on the other. Charles was married to Henrietta of France, whom he had first seen at a ball during his romantic expedition to Spain. An article in the marriage-treaty stipulated that to the Queen should belong the religious education of their children, until they should arrive at the age of thirteen ; and some ascribe their subsequent disasters to this seemingly trifling concession.

A week after the murder, the royal corse, embalmed and coffined in lead, was buried on the south side of the communion-table, in St. George's chapel, Windsor. It was afterwards removed to the middle of the choir, where it was found entire, 1812, at the interment of the Duchess of Brunswick†.

If, in giving an account of this reign, the author should appear in the light of a partial advocate for Charles, he must plead in his excuse the lively indignation he feels at the opposite conduct of Warner, who takes every opportunity to represent the measures of the King in the worst lights in which hatred could place them, while he glides over the provocations offered

† See Sir H. Halford's pamphlet.

XXV. It is the opinion of Lord Clarendon, that in the twelve years preceding the Long Parliament, the kingdom was in a flourishing condition; and that the Protestant religion advanced more against Rome by the writings of Laud and Chillingworth, than in the whole course of the Reformation.

Hume believes the civil war to have been entirely religious; and even the more sagacious among the popular leaders to have been, not hypocrites, but dupes of their own zeal. Warburton, on the other hand, affirms, that Charles might have quelled the Puritans if he had made concessions as to civil liberty. These opinions are at variance; and neither seems correct. The Parliament demanded civil concessions, and Charles would have been more secure had he granted fewer.

Amidst the general defection from this unfor-

by the Commons, often without mention, and always without condemnation. The same may be observed of Neale.

It is the fashion to accuse Charles of insincerity. But could his attachment to episcopacy be otherwise than sincere, when, by giving up that point, he might have gained either the high Presbyterian Scots, the low Presbyterian Parliament, or the Independent army? Could he be otherwise than sincere, when for episcopacy he sacrificed his life?

Bishop Burnet has assailed the character of Charles with the little-minded petulance of party-spirit.—But let us rather adhere to the testimony of Clarendon, who pronounces the martyred Sovereign to have been the worthiest gentleman, the best master, the best friend, husband, father, Christian, whom the age he lived in produced.

fortunate monarch, the two universities continued firm in the principles of loyalty. Both melted their plate for the supply of his necessities; and when an attempt was made in 1647 to impose the covenant upon Oxford, its members published a spirited declaration, in opposition to that instrument; neither intimidated by parliamentary visitors, who they knew would construe apology into defiance, nor by the presence of Presbyterian forces, a rougher species of visitors, then garrisoning the town. They objected to an oath not to assist the King against the Parliament, as contrary to the oath of allegiance. A new oath could not be taken, they affirmed, without the sanction of an act of parliament; nor without permission of the Sovereign, where his interest was concerned. They further objected to supporting the worship of another kingdom, having a doctrine not better, and a discipline worse, than their own. They objected to pronouncing episcopacy an anti-christian government; or rites, which were indifferent, positively unlawful. They did not see the corruptions of the English church; nor would they desert the bishops, martyrs, and confessors, who had been the venerable fathers of the Reformation. They objected to overturning the ancient government of the church, without an adequate reason of necessity or convenience: nor could they consent to range it with Popery, heresy, and profaneness. In short, they offered four decisive reasons against

abolishing episcopacy. First, the antiquity of the institution; being either of divine right or apostolical parentage *. Secondly, they had subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, one of which, the thirty-sixth, declares that episcopacy is not contrary to Scripture. Thirdly, the church of England is interwoven with the civil constitution: and it is uncertain what unforeseen evils may lurk in alteration. Fourthly, to defend the King, *in the support of true religion*, is a dangerous limitation to the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, by which all subjects are bound to a general adherence to royalty.

In the hope of revolutionizing this refractory university, the Parliament sent down a bevy of popular preachers. These men, however, instantly became the laughing-stock of the students; who, among other witticisms, termed their weekly meeting for solving cases of conscience, "The Scruple Shop." On the return of the orators from this unsuccessful mission, the Parliament proceeded with a rougher hand; and having deposed Fell the vice-chancellor, sent down the Earl of Pembroke as his successor. This nobleman's arrival was hailed with a number

* Aërius was pronounced a heretic for supposing a parity between bishop and presbyter; and scarcely any other in the first ages did so. Antiquity affords a sanction for infant baptism, and for the canon of Scripture; wherefore, then, should it not likewise warrant episcopacy?

of squibs, entitled, "The Owl at Athens," and "Lord have mercy upon us;" which last words were written upon houses infected with the plague. In return for these compliments, he removed all the heads of colleges, excepting only seven time-servers; with all the professors saving three: and as Mrs. Fell, the lady of the vice-chancellor and dean of Christchurch, refused to relinquish her home, the gallant Pembroke commanded her to be carried out by force in her chair, and set down in the middle of the quadrangle. After these anecdotes the reader will be somewhat amused to hear a grave historian complaining of the Oxford students, for offering unmannerly provocations to gentlemen disposed to behave to them with all gentleness and moderation. Not less than 356 fellows and scholars were removed from the university*.

* The new professors were ridiculed by the students as men of inferior abilities to those whom they came to displace: but the historian of the Puritans imputes this censure to malice, and with a flourish in which his fair manner of representing facts is eminently conspicuous, affirms that the Tillotsons, Patricks, Souths, Caves, Spratts, Kidders, Whitbys, Bulls, Boyles, Newtons, Lockes, and other Goliaths in the three succeeding reigns, owed their education to this relay of professors.

Now let the reader contemplate how many perversions of truth are here crowded together in a single sentence.

The following is a list of the new professors, and of their deaths.

XXVI. In the reign of Charles the CATHOLICS enjoyed considerable security, being countenanced

Ward	Astronomy	Died. 1668.
Wallis	Geometry Savilian .	Lived to old age.
Louis de Moulin .	History	1680.
Cross	Nat. Philos.	1676.
Button	Public Orator	1680.
Harmer	Greek	1670.

Now, first, not any of these were *very* eminent scholars; secondly, as James II. ascended the throne in 1685, they were all in their graves by that time, excepting Wallis: so that none of the others ever saw even the second reign after their appointment: nor is it likely that men, professors in 1647, could be the teachers of many learned characters, who flourished from thirty-five to fifty-five years afterwards: i. e. from 1685 to 1702, when William died. So much for the THREE reigns.

But further, holding these facts in remembrance, let us consider the dates and other circumstances which follow.

	Born.	College Terms.	Died.	University.
Tillotson				Cambridge
Patrick ..	1626 ...	Entered, 1644 .	1707 .	{ Cambridge D.D. in Oxon. 1666.
South ...	1633 ...	----- 1651 .	1716 ..	
Cave				Cambridge
Spratt ...	1636 ...	----- 1651 .	1713 ..	Oxon.
Kidder				Cambridge
Whitby ..	1638 ...	----- 1653 .	1700 ..	Oxon.
Bull	1634 ...	----- 1648 .	1709 ..	Oxon.
Boyle lived in Oxford, not as a student, from 1654 to 1666.				
Newton				Cambridge
Locke ...	1632....	Entered, 1651 .	1704 ..	Oxon.

Here, observe, of the eleven divines and literati said to have been educated by these new Oxford professors, five were Cam-

by the Queen, Henrietta. The quarrels of the different reformed parties were meat and drink to those who believed that the true mode of settling differences was by reference to an infallible standard. It is no wonder that the King, when in want of money, should lean towards these loyal

bridge men: a sixth came as a resident gentleman to Oxford, after having finished his studies and travels.—Of the remaining five it is not very likely that, parties running high, Bull and Whitby, considering their course of studies, and high church principles, would attend these puritanical lecturers. To Locke, then, a Leviathan, Mr. Neale and his professors may lay claim; if, indeed, they have the boldness to claim the mind of Locke; and they are welcome, into the bargain, if they please, to Spratt; and to South, the other sprat.

When the King was with the army, his friends the ejected clergy petitioned him for restoration to their livings*. But an ordinance issued forth, Aug. 12, by the Parliament, intimated to these starving wretches that they had applied in a quarter where little relief was to be obtained. It directed the apprehension of every minister who should attempt to recover his former benefice; and one month's imprisonment for each offence. Thus were fulfilled that body's amiable intentions (announced by their panegyrist, Neale) of keeping the livings open for their rightful owners, by refusing induction to the new incumbents! Every remonstrance, however, where abuse exists, is productive of some advantage. One or two divines, who were inclined to Puritanism, and had been quiet during the disturbances, received a pittance, to keep body and soul together. Out of the munificence of the spoilers, the Bishop of Durham was, on this occasion, favoured with 100*l.* per annum.

* See Walker's *Sufferings of Clergy*, p. 145.

subjects. In the early part of the reign, the archbishop of York received a commission to compound with all popish recusants in the northern counties, and to propose a dispensation from the penal laws under which they suffered. They were eager to purchase toleration with contributions.

In 1637, Adams, in a sermon at Cambridge, asserted, that confession to a priest was necessary to salvation. With reference to the church of Rome, he observed, that we ought not to refuse the grapes because the stalk was withered, or the gem, because it lay on a dunghill. Being censured for this doctrine, he refused to retract; and it does not appear what further notice was taken of the subject.

Nearly about the same time, Panzani and Con requested the King to allow the English Catholics a bishop of the English nation, to be nominated by Charles, who should prescribe the limitations. A question, however, was proposed, whether the Pope would allow of a bishop, who held the oath of allegiance to be a lawful engagement; and whether he would permit the English Catholics to take that oath. Panzani, having no commission to answer this question, left the kingdom. But Con, his agent, remaining, and beginning to intrigue, Laud complained of him at the council-table, as well as of the general growth of the Catholic interest. Charles acknowledged the grievance, and several reputed Catholics were forthwith

driven from the court—a fresh testimony to the popery of both the sovereign and the primate!

Franciscus de Clarâ, a Franciscan, whose real name was Christopher Davenport, published, at this juncture, an Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, with a view to reconcile the English and Roman churches; but it pleased neither party. In 1637, not less than 11,970 popish recusants were numbered in the twenty-nine southern counties of England*.

A singular treaty was formed in 1646, between Ormond on the part of the King, and the Irish Catholics, by the terms of which they were to enjoy unlimited toleration, access to all places of trust in the council and army, seats in parliament, and discharge from the oath of supremacy. All this is precisely what is now demanded for that body, as strict justice and complete toleration: yet Mr. Neale, the friend of liberty of conscience, terms the articles of the treaty scandalous, and asks angrily, “Was this the way in which the monarch showed his sincerity, as a protector of the Protestant religion?”

XXVII. Few *Acts of Parliament*, connected with our subject, could be passed in a reign wherein few parliaments were assembled; for the ordinances of the two houses, which have been al-

* Clarendon, vol. i. p. 148.

ready specified, were not parliamentary acts. Two acts, inflicting penalties on the violators of the Lord's Day, and one against drunkenness; one requiring Papists to attend their parish-church; and one transferring matters of perjury from the Star-chamber, on its abolition, to the courts of common law, may serve to illustrate the history of these troubled times.

XXVIII. One principal ornament of the period we have been considering, was that learned Talmudist, the elder Buxton. In the humbler, but more useful walk of practical divinity, Laud published the posthumous sermons of his friend Andrews; and Herbert wrote two valuable summaries of the pastoral duties, the *Country Parson* and the *Priest to the Temple*; the former in prose, the other quaintly versified. In 1642 died Crisp, an eminent Antinomian divine.

The literary merits of Lightfoot, Coleman, and Selden, have already been sufficiently developed.

The Psalms of Sternhold and Hopkins being complained of as unpoetical, Rouse's version was substituted in their place.

XXIX. When a country is invaded, parties are blended and forgotten in a general spirit of patriotism. But no sooner does the common enemy cease to be an object of apprehension, than the internal factions return to their respective standards. Thus the minority in the House of Commons, during the first years of Charles's reign,

were united by the tie of animosity towards episcopacy : and thus, when they carried their point by the establishment of presbyterianism, the common denomination of Puritans branched into Presbyterians and Independents. This, therefore, is the proper occasion for detailing the history, and examining the principles, of these two sects,

PRESEYTERIANISM.

While the early English reformers adopted moderation as their motto, and only aimed at expunging the gross corruptions of Popery, Calvin in Geneva, A. D. 1541, and Knox and Melvil in Scotland, a short time afterwards, being men of more ardent tempers, conceived that the reformed religion would be more pure the further it receded, in all respects, from the church of Rome : from Antichrist, from the mystery of iniquity, and from the whore of Babylon. Hence they effected an innovation in church-government as well as in doctrine ; maintaining, that, agreeably to the model of the primitive church, the Christian ministry ought to consist of but a single order. Calvin, however, at first affirmed *, that a threefold ministry was commended to us in the Sacred Writings, although afterwards this doctrine was suppressed and denied. According to the Presbyte-

* Calvin. Instit. l. iv. c. 4, § 1.

rians, there is no foundation in Scripture for a distinction between the offices of bishop and presbyter: nor does either the high antiquity or the universality of that distinction afford any good reason why it should not be abolished. The original government of the church was conducted by presbyteries, or associations of ministers, no one among whom was superior to another, save him who was appointed as chairman or moderator. This officer, at first temporary, and afterwards permanent, it is admitted by both the doctors Hill and Campbell *, was converted into a regular bishop so early as the second century.

Geneva and Holland are the chief seats of presbyterianism on the continent. In Scotland, after a contest of a century with episcopacy, it was settled, in 1688, as the established religion.

Presbyterianism appeared in England, in 1572, when Field established the order of Wandsworth, in Surry †. Their numbers were swelled by many Non-conformists, returning, at different times, from Geneva and Holland, whither they had fled to avoid the Marian persecution. Attachment to this mode of religion gained further ground in consequence of the supposed connexion between episcopacy and arbitrary power; while the Scotch covenanters infected numbers of the English Puritans with a keen desire to imitate the discipline

* Theolog. Instit. p. 167; and Lect. on Eccles. Hist. vol. i.

† Fuller, cent. 16, p. 103.

of Geneva. Gathering strength in Parliament, they at length overturned the hierarchy. We may observe, that zeal for communicating what was thought truth, was not the only motive which impelled the Scots to exasperate the English discontents: they apprehended that if Charles should make a compromise with the Parliament, he would revoke the concessions unwillingly granted in the north. As the ministers of the Assembly maintained the divine right of presbyterianism, which they held to be derived from Christ and his Apostles, episcopacy itself could not be more obnoxious to the other sectarists. Presbyterianism in England, however, was marked by one essential distinction from the same mode of religion in Scotland: that of acknowledging the subjection of the church to the civil power in spiritual matters. When in power, the Presbyterians denied the Independents a separate worship; but their sway of intolerance was soon terminated by Cromwell, who subjected England to the management of a body of commissioners, partly Presbyterians and partly Independents *. Episcopacy returned with Charles II. and, being reinstated in power, passed the act of uniformity, by which 2000 ministers, attached to

* That is a lame argument which is drawn from the charitable indulgence of an adversary. At Uxbridge, the sufficiency of Presbyterian ordination was maintained, from the recent acknowledgment of the validity of Presbyterian baptism in France and the Low Countries, by the English bishops.

Presbyterian government, were ejected from their cures in one day. At present, the descendants of the ancient Presbyterians, together with other dissenters, bask in the beams of toleration. From the nature of their church-government, they receive a bias towards principles of extreme freedom in civil matters; but they are not enemies to limited monarchy, and most of them disclaim that exclusive spirit which disgraced the leaders in the Long Parliament. In the reign of Charles I. the Presbyterians were rigid Calvinists. At present the name of Presbyterians is somewhat loosely and improperly applied to various bodies of Protestant dissenters, who have not even the mode of church-government by presbyteries and synods, and who, in doctrine, are Calvinists, Arians, or Socinians*. Their most eminent divines have been enumerated in Mr. Evans's Sketch (a work uniting considerable information with various mis-statements, and a vast quantity of trumpery †).

* All sweeping imputations are illiberal and unjust. Presbyterians are proverbially said to be insincere: Beware of a horse behind, a bull before, and a Presbyterian on all sides. That an insensible bias in a Presbyterian's mind inclines him to take up a slander, unsupported by a shadow of evidence, against a churchman, especially if he were a minister, I think I could easily prove; but this is, perhaps, common to all sectaries, and is not the slightest evil of dissent.

† Baxter, Bates, Howe, Owen, Williams, Neale, Henry, Stennett, Evans, Gale, Foster, Leland, Grosvenor, Watts, Lardner, Abernethy, Doddridge, Grove, Chandler, Gill, Or-

THE INDEPENDENTS.

XXX. The Independents emanated from the Brownists, of whom a full account was given in our history of the reigns of Elizabeth and James. Robinson, of Norfolk, the father of the sect, was pastor of a Brownist congregation in Leyden, 1610, and new-modelled his church on the two principles of greater moderation in sentiment, and more regular order in discipline: yet still “*Independenter* (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo *.” His improved system was conveyed into England, 1616, by Henry Jacobs, who had escaped thence to Holland, from Bancroft’s persecuting measures against the Puritans. But, intimidated by the statutes enacted against Non-conformists, the new sect lurked in obscurity, with little accession of force, for upwards of twenty years†. In the mean time

ton, Furneaux, Farmer, Towgood, Robinson, Price, Kippis, and Priestley. Yet though these worthies have here met amicably in one sentence, it is much to be suspected that they would not very well agree, were they all to be assembled together in one room.

The Presbyterians have academies at Hitchin and Carmarthen, six Glasgow exhibitions, and a library in Red Cross Street.

* Apolog. c. 5, p. 22; Mosheim, c. 5, p. 405.

† One of these sectarists, in 1633, carried his child to be rebaptized by the parish-minister: hence arose a dispute, which terminated in the erection of the first Baptist congregation under Mr. Jesse.

Nye and Goodwyn in Arnheim, and Simpson, Burroughs, and Bridges, in Rotterdam, all of them Non-conformist refugees, condemning alike the arbitrary discipline of the Presbyterians, and the indecorous laxity of the Brownists, perfected Robinson's scheme of spiritual association, without any dependence of one church upon another. But their congregations soon broke, as may well be supposed, into various subdivisions, when they had no connecting principle*.

In 1643, the five Independent ministers, after a ten years' voluntary exile, undergone for liberty of conscience, returned into England, invited by

The rest renewed their covenant, resolving to walk together, "so far as God had made, or should make, his ways known unto them." We hear little further concerning them till 1641, when, the hierarchy being broken in power, and the discipline of the church relaxed, they came forth from their hiding-places, and opened a place of worship, in Dead-man's Place, in Southwark. Here their service was interrupted by the marshal of the King's Bench, who committed most of them to prison. Being charged with disowning the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, and preaching in separate congregations, contrary to 35 Eliz.; they avowed before the Lords, that they owned no spiritual head but Christ; that laws could not be made to bind the conscience; and that such as opposed the laws of God ought not to be obeyed. At the same time they willingly disclaimed all foreign jurisdiction. They were dismissed with a gentle reprimand; but this slight inquiry served to draw them into notice, and to increase the number of their adherents.

* Cyprian Anglic.

the state of affairs, and having obtained seats in the assembly of divines, began to gather together separate congregations. But the intolerant Presbyterians, disliking this encroachment, required their coming over to the Scottish and Genevan plans. The Independents refused being concluded by a majority, and insisted on their privilege of toleration; but the Presbyterian brethren rejecting this demand, the five ministers published their apologetical narrative. In the Committee of Accommodation, 1645-6, the Presbyterians had arrogantly ordered that both parties should observe the same directory and confession of faith, for writing against which they inflicted penalties. The Independents demanded ordination, communion, and church-censure, subject to the civil power, within their own congregations. "We will not," said the Presbyterians, "compel the Congregationalists to communicate with us, or to be subject to our classes: but we positively refuse, on three grounds, to allow them the indulgence of distinct places of worship, viz. first, this liberty would be a separation from our rule; secondly, no scriptural examples permit the gathering of churches out of the true church; and thirdly, the indulgence would encourage perpetual schism and endless divisions in the church." The reply of the Congregationalists was modest and moderate: "Our worship will not be separation, but the erection of a sister church, differing in judgment,

yet willing to maintain occasional communion, in regard to hearing, preaching, and the sacrament. In short, our differences may ruffle the fringe, but they will not rend the seamless garment of Christ." But the Assembly divines replied, "If a church requires what is evil, a man is not to withdraw from it, but to forbear compliance; and if the Congregationalists could occasionally unite with them in communion, wherefore could they not unite always? This liberty is denied by the churches in New England. And whereas it is maintained, that to allow a church to be true, yet to separate on account of minor ordinances, deserves not the name of schism; are such subdivisions and fractures in church-government as lawful as they are likely to be infinite? The Independents seem to think that all men have liberty of conscience. The Apostle even pronounces divisions to be schisms, in cases where no separate congregations were formed." In this reply, it is curious to remark, in the first place, how the very moderation of the Independents, in offering occasional communion, was converted into an argument for intolerance; secondly, how the Presbyterians begged the question in dispute, by affirming their church to be exclusively the true church; thirdly, how they sheltered themselves in their unchristian intolerance by the unchristian intolerance of another body in power; and fourthly, how ingeniously they were arguing

against themselves, and condemning their own schism from the church of England. "It is very hard," replied the Congregationalists, "that we should be deprived of toleration in separate worship and discipline, on account of our coming so near to our brethren. If we have not liberty to govern ourselves in our own way, so long as we continue in peaceable subjection towards the civil magistrate, we will deny ourselves by self-banishment from our native country, and by seeking freedom on foreign shores. The Presbyterians think that there is no middle way betwixt rigid uniformity and utter confusion; and that the civil sword is an ordinance of God in their hands, to determine all controversies in theology."

The Presbyterians carried every thing before them in the state, although the Independents were robbing them of their congregations; for, according to the quaint and witty historian of the church, a new inn is never unfurnished with guests. The former had a majority in parliament, and a still greater in the nation; but the influence of cunning, and afterwards of military violence, turned the balance in favour of the fanatical part of the rival sect. Being dissatisfied with Essex, the Parliament gave the command to the open and unsuspicious Fairfax, appointing the able and artful Cromwell as the lieutenant-general over him. Soon afterwards the battle of Naseby was lost, and the unfortunate King surrendered himself into

the hands of the Scottish commissioners. These sold their monarch to the Parliament for 200,000*l*. The star of the Presbyterians was now in its highest ascendant *. They held their sovereign in custody at Holdenby; they had displaced the regular clergy; they had obtained from the two houses, the establishment of their discipline. But the Scotch army being dismissed, 1647, and their order for the disbanding of their own forces, of whom they were jealous, being disobeyed by some general officers, they foresaw the downfall of their power. Then followed the apprehension of the King by Joyce, the dissolution of the Parliament, and the triumph of the military Independents. In fine, the Presbyterians bought and sold their King, and the Independents, or those falsely called so, put him to death. The victim was bound by the one, and immolated by the other †.

* During the few years of their power, it is reported by Edwards, who was one of their party (*Gangræna*), that they had been guilty of all manner of outrages. Extreme unction, Antinomianism, disregard of the Sabbath, lay, women, and boy preachers, Jeroboam's priests (the lowest of the people), were numbered among the grievances introduced. And not less than 176 heretical or blasphemous tenets are enumerated by this author, as having been held by different sects at that time. This picture is, probably, too highly coloured; and, at all events, ought not to operate in exciting prejudice against modern dissenters.

† The Presbyterians may not have intended the King's death. "They wanted to reduce him to the rank of a Doge,

Having committed this murder, the next step of the Rump Parliament was to repeal the oaths of allegiance and supremacy ; like a company of libertines abolishing the seventh commandment. The Independents, when in power, were more tolerant than the Presbyterians ; although from their toleration popery and prelacy were excepted*. Yet even their indulgence towards other persuasions offended the Presbyterians, who denounced *that* liberty which opens the sheepfolds to wolves, and feeds a disease without thinking of the remedy ; which renders the church of Christ, like the ark of Noah, a receptacle for all unclean beasts. The ruling party, however, persisted in their enlarged sentiments ; for, after having ordained that tithes should be abolished, but not before some equally honourable provision for the clergy should be devised,

making the English government a commonwealth, with a King under themselves." Hobbes's Behemoth. But they certainly, in fact, led him to the foot of the scaffold.

It is just to the Independent ministers who were in London at the time of Charles's death, to state that Goodwin and Peters were the only two of their body, who consented to the nefarious sentence. Goodwin had been vicar of Coleman Street, from whence he had been ejected for refusing to admit communicants promiscuously. Neale calumniates or misunderstands Arminianism, in pronouncing Goodwin an Arminian. To say, in an unqualified manner, that man has a free will to repent ; and that the natural man may do things, to which God has annexed grace and salvation, is Pelagianism, not Arminianism. It is the scholastic jargon concerning grace of congruity.

* Collier, vol. ii. p. 861.

they declared, with a liberality not easily accounted for, their intention of retaining the Presbyterian religion as the national church establishment, admitting all churches whose principles tended to godliness. This latitude, however commendable, was attended with immediate evils; for fanatics of all descriptions arose in locust swarms; and to crown the whole, the soldier at Walton with his five candles, who ended with burning the Bible, as a dead and abolished letter*.

Under the patronage of Cromwell the Independents continued in authority; but when episcopacy and monarchy were restored together, they dwindled into their pristine insignificance; and were so weak, in the time of William, as to form an agreement with the Presbyterians for mutual strength and support†. Independent congregations are found in Holland and America, originally planted by the refugees in the reign of Charles I. In Scotland the Haldanites are Independents. Their numbers in England and Wales are supposed to exceed those of both the general and particular Baptists. They have three academies, Homerton, Wrexham, and Hoxton; to which may be added Lady Huntingdon's establishment at Trevecka, now removed to Cheshunt. Of their learned divines I have not been able to procure a

* Walker's Hist. of Independ. Part ii. p. 152.

† Mosheim, vol. v. p. 406, &c.; Whiston's Memoirs, &c.

list, notwithstanding every effort to supply that *desideratum* *.

It may be proper to observe, that in the reign of Charles I. a variety of minor sects assumed the name of Independents (compelling the real ones to style themselves Congregationalists), and shared (at least) the disgrace of bringing the Lord's anointed to the block. But whatever may have been, at that time, the character of the Independents, candour cannot fail to add, that in piety, loyalty, zeal, learning, and usefulness, they now fully vie with their brethren the Baptists.

This sect, on their first appearance, had several fixed, and several fluctuating doctrines. Hence the difficulty of ascertaining their real character; and hence the opposite accounts of them delivered by different historians. In general, their doctrine and discipline hinged on two leading principles: 1st, To receive only what was found in the word of God, and to take nothing on the authority of church practice or human appointment; which they deemed the iron legs and the clay toes of the golden statue. 2dly, Not to be bound in future by their present judgment, but to leave an opening for improvement on maturer views. The principle of their government was, that churches should be co-ordinate; not in the subordination of parochial,

* I have, however, to acknowledge with gratitude the communications of Mr. Simpson of the college at Hoxton, and of Dr. Pye Smith.

provincial, and national. They found the church a chain; they broke it, and made it a heap of rings*. Each congregation was a separate and distinct church, united by voluntary and spiritual ties, and having the exclusive exercise of jurisdiction by elders, but a jurisdiction destitute of temporal sanctions, over its own pastor and members. Admonition alone was their ordinary church censure; nor did they excommunicate, except only in cases the most flagrant. Synods they deemed useful, for the sake of conference; but denied their power of imposing regulations on any particular church. *Actus regiminis a synodis debet porrigi, non peragi*†. The reason was assigned in another aphorism: *Par in parem non habet potestatem*. Hence each congregation sat in judgment over its own minister; who was the only dependent man in the Independent society, and, if aggrieved, had no appeal. “Ecclesiastical establishments, spiritual courts, government among pastors, interposition of the magistrate in religious concerns, or fixed encouragement to any system of doctrines or opinions, were to them alike obnoxious‡.”—“The election alone of the congregation was sufficient to bestow the sacerdotal character: and as all essential distinction was denied betwixt the laity and

* Apolog. Nar. p. 3, 4, &c.

† At the same time an offending church was held liable to the examination of neighbouring religious societies, who, if it persisted in error, might renounce communion with it.

‡ Hume.

clergy, no ceremony, no institution, no vocation, no imposition of hands, was, as in all other churches, supposed requisite to bestow a title to holy orders *." Persons unordained, as probationers for the sacred office, were admitted to preach in their pulpits; and although they were friendly to a regular ministry, they thought that preaching might be performed by others, provided they gave themselves up unto it entirely. We may question how, on their principle of taking the strict letter of Scripture for their guide, they could reconcile this restriction with the tent-making of St. Paul?—Originally, besides deacons (whom they held to be of divine institution †), they had three orders of ecclesiastical officers and rulers, viz. pastors, teachers, and elders ‡. With

* Hume.

† Fifth Article of Association, 1691.

‡ "The enthusiasm of the Presbyterians led them to reject the authority of prelates, to throw off the restraint of liturgies, to retrench ceremonies, to limit the riches and authority of the priestly office. The fanaticism of the Independents, exalted to a higher pitch, abolished ecclesiastical government, disdained creeds and systems, neglected every ceremony, and confounded all ranks and orders. The soldier, the merchant, the mechanic, indulging the fervours of zeal, and guided by the illapses of the Spirit, each resigned himself to an inward and superior direction; and was consecrated by an immediate intercourse and communication with Heaven §."

This passage refers chiefly to that flock of minor sects, who followed in the train of the Congregationalists. Rapin, Echard,

§ Hume, 1644.

respect to their early doctrines, they resembled the flitting sands of Arabia, whose place could not

and Hume, have omitted this distinction ; but Neale and Warner are not more happy in throwing on the Anabaptists, the blame of subverting the state ; for the Confession of that sect, published in 1642, is as moderate and loyal as the Apologetical Narrative of the Independents *.

In truth, a confession, exposition, or apologetical narrative, can afford no test for judging concerning the conduct of the publishing party ; as the principles and practice of even a private individual are often found at open variance. A Balaam may have avarice lurking in his heart ; while " A housefull of silver and gold shall not tempt me to disobedience," may be the canting phraseology of his tongue. That the real Congregationalists were not fanatics is clear ; that they were also, in theory, friends to a limited monarchy, we may admit on the testimony of their Narrative ; yet opening prospects, and unexpected power, may gradually have corrupted their hearts, and they may still have been stained with some drops of the martyr's blood.

But shall it not rather be said, that Hume, and others, in their narrative of the reign of Charles, have calumniated the better part of this sect, and perhaps the only true Congregationalists, by confounding those meek, firm, dignified, and rational members, who obtained seats in the Westminster assembly, with the designing levellers and the fanatical lay preachers of the army ? Let any man candidly attend to the controversy carried on betwixt the Independents and Presbyterians, in the committee of accommodation, and he will be compelled to give the former the praise due to gravity, moderation, loyalty, submission to the state, reasonableness in demand, forbearance from angry reply, a temperate but manly spirit of liberty, and a charity to other sects which put the Presbyterians to the blush. He will separate their cause from that of the mad

* See Neale, vol. ii. ch. 3.

be ascertained. Continually watching for new lights of the sun of truth, no two congregations

preachers in the camp, who took shelter under the designation of these excellent men, and brought on them a foul and unjust reproach.

Baxter * passes a just censure on the unchristian rigour of the Presbyterians, who refused toleration to men not only to be tolerated but to be praised; men whose principle was union in necessary things, liberty in unnecessary, and charity in all. Yet this same Mr. Baxter, who was so well acquainted with every thing, connects, in another place, the Independents of the Assembly with the fanatics of the army. In speaking of the arrival of the latter in London †, he affirms, that "a few dissenting ministers of the Westminster synod began all this, and carried it far on." And here, after saying a thousand pretty things of that writer, Neale turns his back upon his oracle. What then are we to think on this nice and difficult subject? Are we to consider the whole army as a scene of anarchy in religion, consisting of Anabaptists, Antinomians, Levellers, Seekers, Ranters, Socinians, Boehmenists, and Vanists, whom the Cavaliers lumped together under the common name of Independents, as ignorant libertines of the present day term serious persons of all descriptions and denominations Methodists or Calvinists? Or are we to conclude with one historian, that the last seven years of Charles present such a scene of confusion and inconsistent management, that it is difficult to explain the conduct of the several parties?

During the treaty of the Isle of Wight, says Dr. Warner, "the army had sent a remonstrance to the two houses, in order to obstruct it; plainly discovering the intentions of THE INDEPENDENTS to blow up the constitution, and to bury the King, episcopacy, and presbytery, in its ruins." Yet these are the Independents (for he makes no distinction), on whom,

* Life, p. 103.

† Abridg. p. 92.

could think alike, and no one congregation could have any code of settled opinions. The church in Rotterdam was rent with internal discord; and even in that of Arnheim, where better order prevailed, the holy kiss (1 Cor. xvi. 20)—prophecies for exercising the gifts of private Christians (1 Cor. xiv.)—hymns (Ephes. v. 19; Col. iii. 16) (“which, if they boasted no better divinity than music, might much be scrupled at”*)—widows, “as she ministers (the civil wars having left abundance for the office”) (1 Tim. v. 9)—and anointing the dying (James, v. 14), were all successively introduced, as fruits of their changeful principle. In general, however, they professed an agreement in doctrine with the Church of England, as conceived by them to be strictly Calvinistic. Inimical alike to a liturgy, and to addresses wholly extemporaneous, they thought that public prayers should be the premeditated compositions of their ministers. In their places of worship they offered prayers for all in authority, read the Scriptures, sang psalms, and every Sunday gathered a collection for the poor. Louis de Moulin, Mosheim, and others, have espoused the cause of the Independents, whom they pronounce to have been a loyal body; and if their practice was as

a few pages before, he had pronounced so high an eulogium; and concerning whose character and principles he had avowed, that Hume, Rapin, and Lord Clarendon, were alike mistaken.

* Fuller.

their principles, they must stand acquitted of the charge of being “ fanatics, going a note higher than the Presbyterians, and less capable of being restrained within any bounds of temper and moderation*.”

Take away, however, the disloyalty and wildness of fanaticism imputed to them, and in doctrine, government, and worship, the Independents of the present day will be found not widely different from their predecessors. Some of them are said to be Arminians, but the mass is Calvinistic; and their grand principles of isolated congregations, ordination by choice of the flock, power of admission and exclusion in each religious society, and disregard of ancient usage as an interpreter of Scripture, still remain untouched.

In the Treatise prefixed to the present volume of our History, a refutation of the sentiments of both Presbyterians and Independents, relative to church-government, has been attempted. We have shown, in opposition to the former, that the primitive government was episcopal; and to the latter, that it contained the principle and practice of authority vested in individual persons and churches over more congregations than one. It will be remembered, that even if this ground were untenable, episcopacy could still make a stand on the ground of expedience: for the 23d and 36th Articles are exceedingly modest in their preten-

* Hume.

sions, merely asserting the legality of episcopal ordination, and not maintaining it by divine or exclusive right. They speak not the language of attack or condemnation with reference to other forms, and seem as though the church were resting on its defence against the extravagant and exclusive pretensions of the sects. It might be urged, then, that under a monarchical government episcopacy is, by analogy, the proper ecclesiastical establishment. It might be urged, that in presbyteries and synods there is danger lest human passions and politics enter into questions purely moral; lest friendship defend the culpable, and rivalry bear hard upon the guiltless. It might be urged, that Independent societies are in extreme danger of that unsuspected influence which warps the judgment in other popular assemblies: that the rich, the overbearing, the loquacious, the assiduous, the turbulent, will sometimes bear down the meek and modest cause of truth: that the narrow-minded cannot regard the interests of any society on a large and liberal scale; that their horizon is bounded by present advantage; that their opinion is formed from the crust of appearances; and that their decision is the voice of the passions. The minister is, necessarily, either a parasite and a mendicant, who must touch lightly the string of those faults and foibles which adhere to his patrons and supporters; or if he scorn to speak smooth things, and to pro-

phesy deceits, he is an honest man, but an imprudent one. He speaks the truth, and his family suffers for it. It is a painful and perilous trial, to place the most conscientious minister continually in a situation, where he must either seem ungrateful to his most liberal friend on earth, or unfaithful to his Father in heaven. Again, when any matter of dispute arises in the society, if one wealthy Diotrephe, who loveth to have the pre-eminence, shall carry his point in triumph over another, the congregation is either rent by open discord, or secret jealousies disturb the pure spirit of Christian charity: or lastly a swarm flies off from the contentious hive, and endless divisions and subdivisions are the consequence.

In the Church of England the bishop is the apex of a pyramid. Aided by learned and wise advisers around him, and removed from the contagion of those insensible biases which the mind receives from neighbourhood and competition, he is an adequate, he is the best judge of all diocesan matters exclusively submitted to his cognizance. In affairs where legal knowledge and open investigation are required, the law takes its course in ecclesiastical courts. The bishops are supports of the throne: no Bishop, no King. By admission to the court, they are guarantees for the decorum of its manners. By mingling in the supreme assembly of the nation, they watch, with jealous eyes, all laws that might be inimical to

right faith or to pure morality. By being numbered with the highest ranks in society, and by partaking of their honours and titles of respect, they add dignity to the national religion. The mitre reflects the lustre of the coronet.

With reference to the two inferior orders of the church, gradations in this profession, as in all others, are expedient. A deacon is usually a very young man. He cannot pronounce the absolution, or consecrate the bread and wine in the eucharist; and some experience, some tried gravity, might seem, in reason, requisite to the performance of these extra-solemn offices. Persons are admitted to deacons' orders at the age of twenty-three; to priests' orders, one year later; and this, after a new and stricter examination, relative to their talents and morals; an ordinance which provides, that the minister, during the first year of his ecclesiastical life, shall establish the salutary habits of weaning his mind from secular pursuits; of retaining his academical information; and of establishing a character for gravity, piety, morality, application, and knowledge, which shall be a pledge for his behaviour throughout the whole of life*.

It has been objected by the Independents to the Church of England, that the people do not choose their own pastors; which has been called their unalienable right. The pretended instances are

* My own Sermon in the Reasonableness of the Church.

those of Matthias and the seven deacons; but Matthias was chosen by God: and only one hundred and twenty of the congregation, who must at least have consisted of five hundred (1 Cor. xv. 6), were present: and as the Seventy, and the eleven Apostles, must have made eighty-one of these, no power can be inferred as residing in the laity to elect without the help of church officers.

In the choice of the seven deacons (who were not properly intrusted with cure of souls), the people were guided and limited by the Apostles; the number was confined to seven; and the company out of which they were to be chosen, as well as their qualifications, were moreover distinctly pointed out.

The Apostles, the foundation of the church, were chosen by Christ, previous to the forming of a congregation: neither did the Apostles consult the people in regard to whom they should ordain: they created early converts to be bishops and ministers of those who should hereafter believe*. Did St. Paul commit the choice of bishops and deacons, in Ephesus and Crete, to the people? No; but to Timothy and Titus. St. Paul even cautioned Timothy against popular election: election by persons having itching ears. It is probable that Titus received a similar caution: since election would not be incautiously placed in the hands of Cretans, described by St. Paul as liars and evil beasts.

* Sleater's Ans. to Sir P. King, p. 90; Clem. ad Corinth. Ep. i.

It must be remembered that it is ordination, and not nomination, that makes a bishop or a congregational priest. It is, therefore, nothing, that the King in England, and other countries, nominates the one, and lay patrons the other; since, if an improper person is nominated, a bishop ought to suffer any extremity sooner than yield compliance. Kings and emperors interfered to prevent the broils and bloodshed which attended the popular election of bishops: and lay patronage is coeval with established Christianity itself, as it encouraged the building and endowing of churches. In Independent congregations, the popular election is the call; and the laying on of hands is designed only to make it public.

God, who is the God of peace and order, could never direct pastors to be elected by popular choice; a mode of appointment which would split the church into ten thousand fractions: for, if the people have an unalienable right to elect, each disappointed minority, without end, in contested elections, has likewise an unalienable right to elect. In Dr. Seaman's church mentioned by Sherlock, the small number of thirty electors, after prayer, fasting, and sermons, were unable to agree. But suppose the pastor even unanimously elected, and living twenty years among the people, in this period one half of the electors die; and a new congregation have a right, an unalienable right, to a fresh election. Take this principle in conjunction with the independence of

congregations on each other, the absence of all general jurisdiction or bond of connexion, and what system can be conceived more destructive to Christian unity*?

As the ancient Independents and Presbyterians, together with a large body of the church ministers, were doctrinal Puritans, or, in other terms, Calvinists; and as a considerable number of religious descendants of each of these classes, together with some other sects, exist at this time in England, professing the same tenets, we now seem to have arrived at the proper part of our work for examining the quinquarticular controversy.

* It is worthy of remark, that Calvin himself was by no means consistent in his professed attachment to Presbyterianism. In the fourth book of his Institutes, ch. iv. § 1, after stating, that although the episcopal canons contain some things not to be assented to; nevertheless he adds, "*cautione totam suam œconomiam composuerunt, ad unicam illam veram Dei normam, ut facile videas nihil fere hâc parte habuisse à verbo Dei alienum.*"—"Quemadmodum tradidimus triplices ministros nobis commendari in Scriptura, ita quicquid ministrorum habuit vetus ecclesia, in tres ordines distinxit. Nam ex ordine Presbyterorum partim eligebantur pastores ac doctores; reliqua pars censuræ morum et correctionibus præerat. Diaconis commissa erat cura pauperum, et eleemosynarum dispensatio. Itaque Hieronimus ubi quinque proposuit ecclesiæ ordines, enumerat episcopos, presbyteros, diaconos, fideles, catechumenos, &c." See the whole section, where it is plain that the two latter are not ecclesiastical offices.

APPENDIX TO THE REIGN OF CHARLES I.

ON THE QUINQUARTICULAR CONTROVERSY.

Contents.

- I. *Calvinists: Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian; high and moderate.*—II. *Arminians.*—III. *The Five Points examined: the first, absolute Predestination; the second, partial Redemption; the third, the total Depravation of Man; the fourth, the special Call of the Elect; the fifth, the Perseverance of the Saints.*—IV. *Were the early English Reformers, Calvinists?*—V. *Are the Articles Calvinistic?*—VI. *Is the Liturgy?*—VII. *Are the Homilies?*—VIII. *Were the Formularies deemed Calvinistic at and after their Appearance?*—IX. *Comparison of the Formularies with those of other Churches, avowedly Calvinistic.*

I. **THE** Protestants agreed, in general, in rejecting the Romish doctrines which related to the Papal supremacy, the traditions of the church, transubstantiation, purgatory, penance, auricular confession, image-worship, invocation of saints, masses for the dead, monastic vows, and the admission of more sacraments in the church than two. On other points, however, soon after the

Reformation, many of the reformed churches were at open variance: and no subjects were more warmly contested than those which involved the doctrines of predestination, faith, and spiritual influence.

As Zuinglius was the father of the doctrines, and Calvin of the church discipline of Geneva, the term Calvinist was originally applied chiefly to the advocates of Presbyterian ordination and government; but since the synod of Dort, the name has been confined to all who embrace the views of the Gospel entertained by Calvin, and as a mark of opposition to the disciples of the Arminian school.

The Calvinists, however, were not wholly agreed amongst themselves. They were either sublapsarians or supralapsarians: the former asserting that Adam was free to stand in paradise; while the latter held that God had decreed his fall from all eternity, and that he could not possibly have avoided his sin or its consequences. As this dispute seems matter of mere speculation, and has little or no bearing on the characters and fate of mankind, it needs not long arrest our attention. The sublapsarian scheme is, comparatively speaking, more favourable to the attributes of God, than the horrible hypothesis of the opposite party: but it is defective in analogy, by ascribing to Adam a free will, a moral agency, and to his posterity, none. The supralapsarians are more shocking, but more consistent, in their opinions,

by representing Adam, and every son of Adam, as all machines together.

Another distinction is drawn between high and moderate Calvinists: the former accompanying Calvin to the furthest extent of his positions, while the latter yield him only a partial accordance. The moderate Calvinists admit the doctrine of universal redemption, and by consequence of spiritual influence unlimited in regard to persons; holding that every man may be saved, unless he is wanting to himself. It is clear, however, that this principle, if closely pursued, is totally incompatible with the whole of the five points. A moderate Calvinist is a contradiction in terms; it is an universal particularist; and too great an absurdity to stand the test of reason. Baxter, indeed, admitted the positive election of a certain number, and denied the absolute reprobation of any: meaning that the salvation of all the rest is contingent by depending on their voluntary improvement or rejection of sufficient grace vouchsafed. This, however, strikes at the root of every one of the five points; of the 1st, by omitting the *passing-by* system; of the 2d, by asserting the universality of Christ's merits; of the 3d, by supposing some portion of inward rectitude in man; of the 4th, by making man himself, in part, the agent in the work of salvation; and of the 5th, by destroying all the others. Neither is this what is meant precisely by moderate Calvinism in the

present times: which is a quibbling and unintelligible distinction between Christ's merits as universally SUFFICIENT, and as, in fact, universally tendered. The Arminians contend that these things are the same. The moderate Calvinists, if pressed upon their distinction, will shuffle and cut, and evade a determinate answer. They will speak of the presumption of prying further into mysteries. They will not go the length of the Arminians and Baxterians, by allowing distinctly that EVERY MAN MAY BE SAVED through Christ, and by grace, if he will.

II. Arminius, the disciple of Beza, was pastor at Amsterdam, and afterwards professor of divinity in Leyden. He had been educated in all the strict opinions of Calvin; but on mature reflection, he began, in 1591, to express doubts as to the severe doctrines of absolute election and partial redemption; and gave his name to those Christians who opposed the five points of Calvinism discussed at the synod of Dort. The Arminians are called Remonstrants, because, in 1611, they stated their grievances in a remonstrance to the States General, and prayed for relief.

III. Having premised these observations, let us now proceed in order, to a consideration of the five points; as they severally relate to absolute predestination, partial redemption, total depravation, involuntary conversion, and indefectible grace.

1. It is held by the CALVINISTS, that God hath chosen, in Christ, a certain number of the fallen race of Adam, before or at the foundation of the world, to be heirs of everlasting felicity; according to his immutable purpose, and of his free grace and love, without respect to the faith, works, or other condition performed by the creature: and that the rest of mankind he was pleased to PASS BY, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sins. In the former case his glory is promoted; in the latter, his justice is displayed*.

The ARMINIANS contend, that God from all eternity determined to bestow salvation on such as he foresaw would embrace the Gospel covenant, through faith working by love; and to inflict everlasting punishment on those, who, as he foreknew, should continue in unbelief, and in resistance of his tender of salvation: so that election and reprobation were alike conditional; although God had a sure prescience how every man would fulfil the conditions. This hypothesis they affirm to be strictly scriptural, and reconcilable with all the texts produced by Calvinists on the opposite side.

* In the language of the synod of Dort, "appointed by the same decree to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity or impenitency."—The Lambeth articles are yet stronger: "The number of the predestinated can neither be augmented nor diminished; those not predestinated, *shall be necessarily damned for their sins.*"

Now, I would ask, at the very first blush of the question, which of these two suppositions accords best with common sense ; with the moral feelings of man ; with the wisdom, the justice, the goodness, the mercy of God ; with the reason of the thing, when man is considered as a responsible being ; with all moral laws, divine and human ; with the thousand calls to repentance with which the Scriptures abound ; with the general scope and tenour of the sacred writings ? And I think there can be but one reply.

Again, if the Calvinistic hypothesis were cordially embraced, would it not be, if man have no option, no free power, to reject grace and salvation granted, or to obtain them, when withheld ; would it not, I say, be the most palpable solecism, the grossest violation of all fair deduction from premises, to regard and treat man as an accountable creature, a moral agent, which the Calvinists (excepting the Antinomians) do every Lord's day, in calls, warnings, exhortations, encouragements, promises, threats ? all of which, if absolute decrees are once admitted, would be superfluous, whether to the elect or to the reprobate. Faith would be vain, and preaching would be vain.—Why should men be entreated to do what they cannot do ? or to shun what it is unalterably determined they shall fall into ? Let the Calvinists act consistently. Let them be all gospellers ; all Crisps, Saltmarshes, Huntingtons, and Hawkers.

Every individual call of theirs to repentance, is an implied doubt and distrust of their own principles. Prayer in like manner is often recommended in Scripture. But prayer would be superfluous and altogether unmeaning, on the hypothesis of unconditional election and reprobation; since no prayer could save the reprobate, and no omission of it could ever ruin the elect.

Again, God is represented by natural and revealed religion to be just, holy, merciful, and true. The doctrine of absolute decrees is in opposition to all these attributes. For is it justice to condemn individuals to eternal misery, for what they never committed? even dying infants, who have committed no actual sin being numbered by the Calvinists as left to punishment, if they be not of the elect. Is it justice in God to punish men for what he decreed they should do? Is that a holy Being, who fixes beforehand, the commission of many sins by an absolute decree? Does to reprobate many, comport with the character of God, as merciful, slow to anger, abundant in goodness, desiring that no man should perish, taking no pleasure in the death of sinners? Is God not willing that any should perish; and yet willing that some should perish? He cannot have two contending wills: Ezek. xxxiii. 11, and xviii. 12. 2 Peter, iii. 9. Exod. xxxiv. 6. God must take pleasure in his own decrees: in the supposed decree, therefore, of unconditional reprobation, he

takes pleasure; how comes it then, that, according to Ezekiel, xxxiii. 11, he takes no pleasure in the perishing of any? God is true: now, general offers of mercy are often made in his word to returning sinners: "Turn ye, turn ye; why will ye die?" But if these offers are false, if some sinners cannot return, and must eternally die, God is not true.

We are required to be holy as God is holy; merciful as he is merciful. But were we to imitate this conduct in our dealings towards our brethren, we should be justly execrated as cruel, capricious, and profligate. We know what holiness and mercy are. Scripture and conscience tell us what they are. We therefore know and feel it to be absolutely impossible that God should act in a manner so unholy and so unmerciful. Abraham knew this, when, referring to the standard of his own moral feelings, he remonstrated with God, "That be far from thee, to destroy the righteous with the wicked; shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" This rule is infallible: for if God were to deal forth a reprobation, which hardly the most worthless among mankind would inflict; man, dreadful conclusion! would be more holy and merciful than God. It were absurdity, it were blasphemy, to conceive this possible. "Shall man be more just than God? a mortal more pure than his Maker?" Job, iv. 17.

Contradictions crowd upon us at every step of

our progress, in examining this tissue of inconsistencies. Independently of the admission of some free agency, some power to reject or accept; our actions are neither good nor evil, neither capable of reward nor punishment. It is the intent, the will, that constitutes a virtue or a crime. Even human tribunals do not put the maniac to death as a punishment for the mischief he commits: and who but a maniac would think of punishing the dagger,—the INSTRUMENT with which the blow was struck? Yet man sinning, is, by the Calvinistic system, this instrument, this blind, unresisting dagger in the hands of God, the decreer of the blow. Away with remorse if the sin was unavoidable. Away with penitence if it be never to avail. Why should we STRIVE to enter in at the strait gate, if we MUST either enter in thither by force, or MUST go forward by necessity to destruction? But it is impossible to drive self-approbation and compunction from the breast. We know, we feel, that we have a certain agency; that some circumstances are more favourable to our virtue than others; and that we can apply ourselves to these, or can turn away from them.

Once more: all attempts to moderate and soften this “horribile decretum” (as Calvin himself confesses it to be), by the admission of election and denial of reprobation, by the admission of general and denial of special grace, or by whatever other

language the same nonsense may be expressed (excepting the hypothesis of Mr. Baxter, which is no Calvinism at all), are vain, delusive, and unfounded. There is no middle way. If we adopt this system, in any degree or respect, we must take it with all its monstrous and fearful consequences. It is to no purpose that we close our eyes. If we admit of absolute election, we must admit of absolute reprobation. It is a cruel mockery of those who are supposed to be passed by, to tell them that they enjoy (although they cannot *inherit*) the benefit of God's promises. Every argument, therefore, every reason, every text, every feeling, which militates against absolute and unconditional reprobation, is valid by consequence against absolute election, and is a death-blow to the whole system.

To descend now to particulars, we affirm, in the first place, that there is no foundation in Scripture, for a decree of absolute reprobation. Let any man consult the passages in which the word reprobate, *αδοκιμος*, occurs, and he will invariably find it to signify a rejection in consequence of actual disobedience. This is the case with respect to the texts which follow: 2 Tim. iii. 8. Rom. i. 20—28. Tit. i. 16—9. Heb. vi 8. 1 Cor. ix. 27 *.

* See *Parkhurst's Lexicon*, and *Macknight on the Epistles*. *Αδοκιμος* has a passive sense, *disapproved* after trial, like dross in refining metals (see the Seventy on Isaiah, i. 22; and Prov. xxv. 4); and an active sense, viz. undiscerning.

The Calvinists object, that it is said in Proverbs, xvi. 4, "God made even the wicked for the day of evil:" a text, says Whitby, which plainly means, that God appointed wicked persons, perishing impenitently, to be obnoxious to divine wrath: "on such men, long incorrigibly depraved, the day of evil will ultimately come*." The next passages to be considered are, John, xii. 39, 40; Luke, viii. 9, 10; and Mark, iv. 11, 12; in which it is said, that God had blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, lest they should be converted; and "that hearing they might hear, and not understand; lest they should be converted," &c. Now, with respect to the first text, Christ in the preceding verses, John, xii. 36, 37, exhorts these very Jews to believe and to walk in the light, &c. Did he exhort them to do what he knew they could not do? Did he exhort them contrary to what he knew to be his Father's will? Not so. He knew them to be capable of salvation: John, iii. 17; v. 24; vi. 29. Luke, xiii. 34; xix. 42. He knew their crime to be, that they would not believe on him, John, xii. 37. The other two passages in Mark and Luke, are explained by St. Matthew, xiii. 15, "THEY had closed their eyes, that they should not see." That the two former were a proverbial expression, signifying voluntary perverseness, appears from Jerem. v. 21, and Ezek. xii. 2.

* Tomline, p. 227. See Rom. ix. 22.

As to the words of St. Peter, ii. 7, 8, they are well explained by Hammond, who states that some Jews, being disobedient, were appointed to aggravate their disobedience by stumbling on the stone of offence.

Nor is there any difficulty in the phrase employed by Jude, 4, "men before ordained unto this condemnation." For the original, *προγεγραμμενοι εις τουτο το κριμα*, "written before unto this sentence," means only, that a sentence of condemnation was written before concerning these men, on account of their foreseen ungodliness; as is evident from the whole context; which, after comparing them to the fallen angels, to Cain, Balaam, Corah, mentions the sentence, as foretold by Enoch, in the 15th verse.

But what shall be said of the striking expressions which follow:—"If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost," 2 Cor. iv. 3; "whom he will he hardeneth," Rom. ix. 18; "God is as the potter who makes a vessel to dishonour," Rom. ix. 21; "the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded," Rom. xi. 7; "God shall send them strong delusion," 2 Thess. ii. 11; and, "they whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world," &c. Revel. xvii. 8.

These texts, which constitute the citadel and last stronghold of Calvinism, are all reconcilable to the Arminian system. In some of them a comparison is implied, in some *expressed*, between the unbelieving Jews and the Gentiles, Rom. ix. 30,

31 ; xi. 7 : in others the immediate context shows, that they who are lost, and who perish (2 Cor. iv. 3 ; and 2 Thess. ii. 10), are those who believe not : 2 Cor. iv. 4 ; and 2 Thess. ii. 12. God may be said to harden an impenitent man, by the motives to penitence which he presents : the continued abuse of which, hardens the sinner more and more ; and God is said in Scripture, to do what he permits only to be done ; as in Matt. x. 34, “ I came to send a sword*.” The phrase of Revelations, “ written in the book of life,” is Jewish, signifying the present right of a just person to life ; and cannot establish the doctrine of absolute election and reprobation, since unbelievers shall be blotted from the book of life ; Revel. xxii. 19 ; and “ he that overcometh shall not be blotted from it,” Revel. iii. 5 †. They who worship the *beast*, then, are the persons, whose names, on account of unbelief and disobedience, were never registered in the book of life.

To these citations, generally, a key is furnished, in

* See Jortin, Dissert. i.

The passage, Rom. ix. 18—24, respecting vessels of wrath, is merely an illustration, and refers only to the present life || : “ Disobedient, whereunto also they were appointed,” 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8 ; not appointed to disobedience, but being disobedient wilfully, appointed to destruction §.

† See Psalm lxix. and Dan. xii. 1, 2, 3.

|| Tomline, Refut. p. 239.

§ See also 2 Cor. ii. 16 ; Rom. xiv. 4. 2 Tim. i. 9, makes redemption generally the work of grace ; and who denies this?

the words of our Lord ; “ He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned,” Mark, xvi. 16 ; and in Luke, xiii. 3, which supposes optional repentance, and admits that to repent is not to perish.

With respect to election, Whitby has very plainly shown, that it is applied in Scripture, not to persons, as in Deut. x. 15, 16 ; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ; and many other passages ; but to churches and nations : that it is an election to the enjoyment of the means of grace, rather than a certainty of being saved by these means ; that it is an election upon faith joined to holiness ; and that its continuance depends on perseverance, which is matter of exhortation : 2 Peter, i. 10, and xi. 5, 6, 7 ; 1 Peter, i. 14 ; ii. 1, 11 ; iv. 2, 3, 15.

Predestination, in fine, is most clearly represented as resting upon the foreknowledge of God. The redemption of mankind was ordained before the foundation of the world ; and the salvation of each individual depending on his own free agency in accepting or rejecting the proposed conditions and helps, God by his prescience foresaw who would accept, and who would reject them ; and the former, whom *he did foreknow*, he also did predestinate, Rom. viii. 29 ; these being elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, 1 Peter, i. 2. The words, “ whom he did foreknow, them he also predestinated to ~~BE~~ conformed to the image of his Son,” Rom. viii. 29, are considered by some

as signifying, “conformed to the glory of his Son*,” v. 17: but if they rather allude to moral conformity, it is important to remember, that the words “to be” have no corresponding word in the original: ἔς προεγνώ, καὶ προωρίσε συμμορφῆς τῆς εἰκονος, &c.

In like manner, Acts, xiii. 48, “as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed,” ought to have been rendered, “as many as were disposed to eternal life:” τεταγμένοι. For in this very book, St. Paul is represented as having proceeded on foot to Assos, for he was so disposed; διατεταγμένος.

Again, “by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners,” cannot signify, were ordained to be sinners: because the corresponding phrase, Rom. v. 19, “by the obedience of one, many were made righteous,” signifies, many were accounted to be righteous.

The Arminians contend generally, that the doctrine of absolute election is contrary to the command of God, “make your election sure†;” to

* Whitby, Disc. i.

† Election is supposed by Calvin to be an infallible decree: would God then call upon any Christian converts to make an infallible decree sure? Tomline, Refut. p. 205 — In this work, ch. iv. it is shown, that many of the epistles set out with addressing the church written to as elect, and then glide into admonitions, not to fall away. Election, then, is not an infallible decree.

Predestination is used in Scripture only in a good sense. “Nefas est dicere Deum aliquid nisi bonum predestinare.” Aug. de Præd. c. ii.

his exhortations to Christians to “continue steadfast,” and to “work out their salvation with fear;” to his cautions, not to fall from grace; to his threats, against drawing back, and turning from righteousness. And whereas the Calvinists urge the glory of God, as promoted by the fatal decrees, these conceive that his glory would shine forth more luminously in a general, than in a partial, tender of grace; not to mention, in reviewing the horrid part of this sentence, that it is a strange way of manifesting the divine glory, to create men for the purpose of destroying them everlastingly.

Calvin, Beza, and other predestinarians confess, that the whole stream of the ancient Fathers flows directly against their hypothesis. Justin Martyr, Irænaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Macarius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Cyril of Alexandria, speak of every man’s ability to be good or bad; and, with St. Ambrose and Theophylact, suppose election to be the result of pious living. “All the ancients,” says Melancthon, “except St. Austin, asserted that there was some cause of our election in ourselves.” St. Austin, indeed, in recoiling from the Pelagian heresy, rushed into the opposite error; but Prosper confesses, that even they who condemned Pelagius, rejected the absolute decree taught by St. Austin, as a mere novelty. Want of room precludes the citation of passages from the Fathers; for these, then, I must refer to the

fifth chapter of Bishop Tomline's Refutation, and to Whitby's First Discourse on the Five Points.

To all this it may be added, that the decrees of God are evidently described, throughout the whole sacred volume, to be conditional. Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, would have repented had they seen miracles. The doom of Nineveh was actually reversed on the deep humiliation of its inhabitants. Shall God deal so with nations, and otherwise with individuals?

2. The second point of CALVINISM may be entitled, Partial Redemption. Christ is said to have made atonement by his death and sufferings, not for the sins of the whole world, but for those of the elect only*.

It is contended by the Arminians, that Jesus Christ, by his sufferings and death, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; yet that none but those who believe in him can be partakers of this benefit.

Those who are pleased to style themselves moderate Calvinists, so far as they have come forth from their obscurity of meaning, qualify this point by declaring, that the Gospel ought to be preached to all men; being abundantly SUFFICIENT to expiate the sins of the whole world. If any are saved, it is through the favour of God; if any are not

* Synod of Dort, Second Art.

saved, this is their own fault, and does not proceed from any defect in the sacrifice of Christ. This quibbling on the word *sufficient*, as differing from *extended*, has already been exposed to animadversion. To the meanest judgment, the gross contradiction of affirming, that Christ died for a predestined part, and of preaching salvation, through his blood, to the excluded and precondemned remainder, must be at once apparent and nauseous. What consolation does the condemned malefactor derive from being told, that his prince had power to pardon him, but did not choose it? “This blood is sufficient for you: but it was not shed for you. An irreversible decree has shut you out: you are to be passed by: repent, then, because repentance can do you no possible good. The decree of exclusion is positive and unconditional; and yet is it your own fault that you do not obtain salvation.” Search the creeds of Paganism, from Lapland to New Zealand, and you will not discover any one more revolting assault upon the common understanding of mankind. This is MODERATE Calvinism *.

* A similar quibble and mockery it is to pronounce, that Christ died to procure salvation for all who will believe and repent; but further, to procure belief and repentance for the elect. For since it is added, that none can believe and repent, but those for whom Christ died to procure belief and repentance, this is expressly the preceding doctrine, only couched in other words. Christ died for all; and for none more than another.

Our principal business, however, is with HIGH Calvinism : with the frenzy at full moon. We affirm, that Christ died, not to save any unconditionally ; not to save all actually ; but to place all in a situation of embracing, by faith and repentance, the covenant sealed with his blood (Acts, xx. 21, xxvi. 18). He did not die to procure repentance and faith for the elect ; for this would be to make the promise, and procure the conditions on *both* sides, which is inconsistent with the nature of a covenant, whereby something is stipulated and performed on *each* side. Besides, an atonement is only supposed to remove the guilt, not to procure further benefits ; and as faith is an assent of the reason, and repentance a conversion of the will, to suppose these absolutely procured for the elect, and denied to all others, is to destroy the sensible meaning of faith and repentance, and to doom the reprobate to punishment, for wanting that which they could not possibly obtain. “ God would have ALL men to be saved,” 1 Tim. ii. 4. “ He is the Saviour of ALL men,” 1 Tim. iv. 10 ; not willing that any should perish, but that ALL should come to repentance, 1 Pet. iii. 10 ; the saving “ grace of God has appeared unto ALL men,” Tit. ii. 12. “ As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation ; so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon ALL men to justification of life,” Rom. v. 16, 17. “ Christ gave himself a ransom for all,”

1 Tim. ii. 6; and “tasted death for every man,” Heb. ii. 9. See also Tit. ii. 13, 14; 2 Cor. v. 15.

On the other hand, where is it ever affirmed in Scripture, that Christ died for a few; or even negatively, that he did not die for all? In one or two passages, indeed, Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28; Rom. v. 19; and Heb. ix. 28; our Lord is spoken of as having died for many: but let it here be observed, that ALL are MANY; and in the passage of Rom. v. 19, “As by the disobedience of one, *many* were made sinners; so, by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous;” the word *many* must needs mean “all” in the first clause; and, therefore, has the same meaning in the second. Or again, these passages and the others just now cited, are reconcilable by affirming that Christ died for *all* in regard to extension of kindness, but for *many*, inasmuch as his death would be effectual only to “as many as would believe and obey the Gospel.”

The same distinction between the death of Christ “intentionally,” and “eventually,” is to be applied to John, x. 15; xiii. 13, 14; and Ephes. ii. 26; where he is said to have laid down his life for his friends, for his sheep, for his church.

But Christ is the propitiation for the WHOLE WORLD, 1 John, ii. 2; even of the WICKED, who deny the Lord that bought THEM, 2 Peter, ii. 1.

And in the many passages where our Lord is denominated the Saviour of "THE WORLD," John, i. 29; vi. 33, 51; 1 John, iv. 14; John, iii. 16, 17; xii. 47; 2 Cor. v. 19; the world must signify the world generally, or in a bad sense, as is its meaning in John, i. 10; 1 John, iii. 1; John, xv. 18, 19; xvi. 33; xvii. 14; 1 John, iii. 13; iv. 5; John, viii. 23; xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 8, 11; viii. 23; xv. 19; xvii. 16; 1 John, v. 19; John, xiv. 17.

The Calvinist is begging a great deal too much, when he would have the world to signify, now the whole, and now a part, just as it may happen to suit his monstrous hypothesis.

But if the elect be the smaller, and a very small part of the world, according to Matt. vii. 14, and xx. 16, where they are called FEW, God might be said, not to have LOVED the WORLD, John, iii. 16; and sent his Son, that it might be saved, v. 17; but to have hated it, and sent his Son to condemn it. For so in common life we speak of any assembly: "the House of Commons voted supplies," means, the majority of the House of Commons.

But, indeed, when Christ is said to have died for the sins of the world, to provide a remedy for a certain evil; the universal nature of the evil implies the universal nature of the remedy. Adam is at the head of one covenant, Christ the head of the other. The evils introduced by Adam, were death and condemnation; but with respect to DEATH, we know that the remedy is as extensive

as the evil: for, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Does not analogy direct the same co-extensiveness to apply to condemnation, the other evil? Excepting the universal taint of corruption (and for this, spiritual influence is provided, sufficient to leave an exercise for probationary creatures), ALL men must be reinstated by the second Adam, in the situation from which all men were degraded by the first *.

Again, we read, "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?" 1 Cor. viii. 11. Here, then, we perceive that Christ died for some who do perish. Where, then, is the limitation? He died for all who perish. So likewise, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Jews are warned not to be guilty of counting the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified, an unholy thing, Heb. x. 26, 27; for

* And this view is confirmed by a multiplicity of texts: Gen. xviii. 18, and xxii. 18; Isa. lii. 10; liii. 6; Luke, ii. 10, 30, 31; John, i. 29; xii. 32; i. 9; iv. 42; ii. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4; iv. 10; Tit. ii. 11; Revel. xxii. 17: in all which passages the ransom is declared to be universal. See also the reasoning in Rom. v. 18, 19. Nay, in the following verse, 20, we learn, that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound;" but sin was universal: to suit the Calvinian system, then, the words should have run, "Where sin abounded, grace did much LESS abound."

That the offer of salvation was general to Jews and Gentiles, see Tomline's Refutat. ch. iv.; Rom. i. 16, &c. That the benefits of Christ's death were extended even retrospectively, we learn from Heb. xi. 4, 5; and Matt. viii. 11.

then there would remain no MORE sacrifice for sin. There was, then, sacrifice for THEIR sin, and there was danger of their neglecting and losing it; i. e. of becoming reprobate, or castaway: Christ, therefore, was a sacrifice for the reprobate.

If ALL MEN were to believe, as they MIGHT, in Christ, John, i. 7; and if "he that believeth not, is condemned," John, iii. 18; viii. 24; i. 36; he died for as many as were exhorted to believe; that is, for all men.

Why is God called a God rich in mercy, if he was sparing of his mercies to the greater part of mankind? Why should Christ say to some, "How often would I have gathered you as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and ye would not?" Matt. xxiii. 37; John, v. 40. "Why does he marvel at the unbelief of the people?" Mark, vi. 6: if he himself had predetermined that the belief of those whom he addressed should be impossible? "*God is love*," Heb. iv. 8. But how could he be so, if he hated, from all eternity, the greater portion of mankind? And, in short, if Christ has only died for some, the numerous passages, exhorting all indiscriminately to repentance, represent God as so full of insincerity, dissimulation, and hypocrisy, that we could place no firm reliance on any part of his revealed word. We are commanded to make prayers and supplications for all men, 1 Tim. ii. 1. But, on the Calvinistic hypothesis, our prayers for many are

wasted breath ; and God has commanded an unmeaning service. The doctrine of partial redemption shakes the general obligation to love God—the best principle of duty ; partly by diminishing the amiableness of his character, and partly by exciting a doubt as to our personal reprobation. No ; I could not love the Being, I could not willingly serve the Being, who had perchance pre-damned me from all eternity.

In the same manner, this dark, unnatural doctrine strikes at the root of thanksgiving, praise, and imitation of the divine nature.

Again, penitent sinners, if redemption be partial, will ever find their hope clouded by a fear, lest Christ should not have died to render their penitence acceptable ; and hence, perhaps, many of those religious glooms and derangements so unhappily frequent in our mad-houses *.

* Is it wise, is it just, is it merciful, first to make a condition, unavoidable to some, and impracticable to others ; and then to reward the former for what they could not shun, and to punish the latter for what they did not choose ? “ God is love,” Heb. iv. 8. Now, what is love ? Let the Apostle answer : “ Whoso seeth his brother have need, and refuseth compassion, how dwelleth love in him ?” 1 John, iii. 17. Yet God sees a great portion of mankind have need of grace, and refuses compassion. God, then, is not love, if he be the God of Calvinism, Mic. vii. 18 ; Acts, x. 35. Does God stint his general bounties of light, health, seasons, to any particular classes of men ? What shall we say, then : is he liberal in the blessings of nature, and a niggard only of his grace ?

It may be said, that arguments drawn from the goodness of God, are equally applicable against the Arminian hypothesis, since the number of the supposed reprobate, and of the actually lost, is the same. But the glory of the divine perfections, and the encouragements to human virtue, are better consulted by the Arminian doctrine. God, however, it is urged, is merciful in even having saved any: his grace is free: he is not obliged to give it to any. But God is not merciful or just to those to whom he refuses his grace, in demanding from them a service, to which grace is necessary. He is like an Egyptian task-master, demanding brick and allowing no straw.

The testimonies of authors, from the first to the twelfth century, have been produced, on this subject, by Mr. Dally *, who concludes, that for the first eight ages of Christianity, not one writer expressly said that Christ died only for the elect †.

3. We now proceed to consider the third of the five points—the total depravation of man. Adam being the public head and representative of

* See Whitby.

† It is objected, that if Christ died for all, his death, as to many, was to no purpose; that if God wished the salvation of all, he wished what he could not accomplish. But these, and several other passages, all proceed on the mistake of not distinguishing between the power of God, who can do all things, and his power, modified by his will, in dealing with man as a moral agent.

the human race, the DISCIPLES OF CALVIN maintain, that the guilt of his sin was imputed, and a corrupt nature conveyed to the whole of his posterity: that this corruption *pervades* the whole soul, rendering it unable to turn to God, or to do any thing truly good; and that by this original sin, and the actual sins which follow, men are subject to death, and all miseries, temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

The ARMINIANS subscribe to the doctrine of universal human corruption; but not to the full extent implied in its being said TO PERVADE THE WHOLE SOUL, conceiving that the soul has yet some moral sensibilities left. Their third article is as follows: "that true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, or from the force and operation of free-will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable of thinking or doing any good thing; and that, therefore, it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be REGENERATED, and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ*.

* It is necessary to attend to this statement of the third Arminian tenet, which is copied from Mosheim, vol. v. p. 444; as in some popular works, such as Gregory's Church History and the paltry Sketch of Evans, the following very different account is given: "that mankind are not totally depraved, and that depravity does not come upon them by virtue of Adam's being their public head; but that mortality and na-

The third and fourth of the five points are so intimately connected, that a reply to the one will be decisive, in a general sense, as to the other; and Whitby, Tomline, with other writers, appear to have swerved, on this and on the following head, from the precise points in controversy *. That point, since both the contending parties are agreed in believing all good to originate with the Spirit of God, must resolve itself into the question, Are the motions of the Spirit the sole operators in conversion? The Calvinists say, "YES:" while it is

tural evil only are the direct consequences of sin to his posterity."

The Calvinist affirms the consequence of Adam's sin, to his posterity, to be not only the general and total taint deserving punishment, but moreover a transmitted imputation of that great forefather's sin. This sin the Arminian conceives to have been forgiven to Adam himself, upon his repentance; and, therefore, not to have descended, by imputation, upon his posterity. Such are their opposite explanations of Rom. v. 18.

* The Bishop of Lincoln's Refutation is an able work; but, unhappily, its utility is, in many parts, impaired by its total want of method and precision. Neither has his Lordship rightly baptized his work; in many places, it is a refutation, not of Calvinism, but of METHODISM; and, in other parts, of Antinomianism.

I may be permitted to add, that some acknowledgments might have been made to Whitby, a great deal of whose excellent matter has been borrowed, though with much valuable amplification; but whose more excellent arrangement, and self-restriction to the points in question, have both been unfortunately neglected. Sic vos non vobis.

contended by the Arminians, that these spiritual influences incline, but do not force; that they are administered in such measure as to leave unto man, as a moral agent, an exercise of the will in accepting or rejecting them; and, consequently, that the admission of any portion of will to accept, excludes the Calvinistic idea of TOTAL DEPRAVATION.

In Scripture "GRACE" is employed to import, not spiritual influences, but "FAVOUR," generally (Tit. ii. 11; Acts, xx. 32; xxiv; xv. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9). Now, although forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God be conditional, being suspended, as we maintain, on the faith which accepts that grace; yet since it is by the absolute and unconditional favour, or grace of God, that we receive any offer of forgiveness at all, and since it is by grace or favour that this faith is accepted for righteousness—we may be properly said, in embracing the Gospel through faith, to be justified and saved by the grace of God. "By grace ye are saved through faith, &c." (Ephes. ii. 8)*.

Thus far all is consistent with such an operation of the Spirit on the understanding and the will, as shall leave to these two faculties an option

* As to those quickening influences of the Holy Ghost, by which men are enabled, through the Spirit, to mortify the deeds of the flesh; they are manifestations and consequences of divine grace, but are not to be considered, because they occur not in Scripture, as signifying grace itself.

of embracing or repulsing it. Grace, as acting by prompting us to good, may be called exciting grace; by dissuading us from evil, restraining grace; by going before our desires, preventing grace; by aiding our efforts, assisting grace; by concurring with us in diligence, furthering grace: and as all these spiritual influences descend from God alone, to him alone be the glory given. But still all these may be only motives and impulses, which man, as a moral agent, may obey or disobey. That they are so, is what we shall attempt to prove. In the outset we must deprecate and debar all arguments drawn exclusively from the power of God. We acknowledge that God is omnipotent; and might have rendered the influences of his Spirit, if he had pleased, partial as to persons, partial as to time; indefectible, irresistible, independent of co-operation. The question is not, what God could do, but what he actually does: he MIGHT certainly have dealt with his creatures as with machines: we affirm, that he deals with them as with moral agents. Man feels himself, in some degree, a free agent; his "conscience accusing or excusing" (Rom. ii. 15). It is impossible to preach down the law of the heart, this solemn voice of self-approbation or reproach. Heathen writers consider the existence of this inward monitor as a self-evident truth: infidel philosophers have reasoned upon it; and Christian writers, treating of natural religion, have con-

stantly made it the basis of their arguments, appealing to the general sense of mankind*. The danger of a contrary doctrine ought also to bring its truth under suspicion. It leads to remissness, as if we could do nothing by activity, and were irresponsible; it leads to resting the whole of our obedience in prayer, as if the Spirit of God were solely answerable for all the rest.

The wisdom, the justice, the holiness of God, are best glorified by supposing him not to exhort some men in Scripture to impossibilities, and other men to what they cannot avoid; for so he would really do on the hypothesis of the decrees, united to that of irresistible grace. The notion of total depravity, indeed, giving all to spiritual influence, and leaving no co-operation whatever to the human soul, is wholly inconsistent, in the case of all men, with exhortations to duty, and with the sanctions of reward and punishment. Invitations to repent, accompanied with promises and threats—calls to watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation—benefits conferred by God, for the purpose of seeing whether the recipients would walk in his ways or not, imply a state of probation, a decision of the understanding, an option of the will. And since that decision and that option, when exercised in embracing grace, is so far actively good, the Spirit is so far not the entire operator in conversion; and man is, to that extent, not totally de-

* See Butler's Analogy, p. 81 and 135.

praved (Deut. viii. 2 and 16; xiii. 3; Judges, ii. 21; iii. 4; Exod. xvi. 4; Ezek. xviii. 26—28).

Add to these remarks, that the doctrine of persuasion without compulsion, is generally taught by the ancient fathers; by Irenæus, by Justin Martyr, by Cyril of Alexandria; who all disclaim the hypothesis of invincible necessity, as confounding the distinctions of virtue and vice, and destroying the probationary condition of man. These sentiments have gained force with the tide of time, and have been confirmed by the most enlightened commentators in later ages. Even AUGUSTINE says, “If there were not grace, how would the world be saved? if there were not free-will, how would the world be judged*?” Bishop Bull declined determining the exact measure of *gratia divina et liberum arbitrium*; yet certainly believed the fact of their joint action †. And Dr. Doddridge (on John, vi. 44) declares, “That the drawing of God must necessarily suppose divine agency; but does not, therefore, exclude our consent to follow:” while in his comment on Rom. viii. 26, “the Spirit helpeth our infirmities,” he states rightly, that *συναντιλαμβάνεται* means the taking up of one end of a burden.

It is urged by the advocates for total depravity, and for the SOLE operation of God in the work of conversion, that the comparison of this work to a

* Vol. ii. p. 791, Ben. edit.

† Harman, Apost. Dissert. Post.

new creation and a new birth (2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. vi. 15 ; Ephes. ii. 10 ; Tit. iii. 5), refers to the plastic power of the Creator over matter. But in all arguments drawn from analogy between the physical and moral world, allowance is ever to be made for the agency of reasonable beings. There is a foundation for the metaphor, because the impulse begins with God ; and the Scriptures speak of creation as applied to man, in the sense of a change for the better. " Create in me a clean heart, &c." (Psalm li. 10 ; Isaiah, lxxv. 18). When, however, we are exhorted to " put on the new man" (Ephes. iv. 24), and to be renewed in the spirit of our minds (ver. 23), we are plainly directed to a co-operation. Again, in our natural birth, we are passive under the hand of God ; our spiritual birth is produced by the moral persuasion of the Divine Word. " Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. x. 17). Man, therefore, may be spiritually created anew, and born of God, without supposing God to act exclusively of human co-operation*.

As to the texts, 1 Cor. ii. 14, " The natural man discerneth not the things, &c." and John,

* Bishop Tomline has clearly demonstrated the word " regeneration" to be invariably considered in Scripture, and in our public formularies, as signifying the work of baptism ; but it seems to me, that his Lordship might have saved himself that trouble, since, if mental renewal, or conversion, is mentioned in Scripture, it is idle to dispute about a word.

vi. 44, "No man can come, except the Father draw him;" Acts, xi. 18, and Ephes. ii. 8, which represent God as giving faith and repentance; Ezek. xi. 19, 20, which states him to be the giver of a new spirit; and Philip. ii. 13, with Heb. xiii. 21,—they are all reconcilable with human co-operation, and suppose it. God's first gifts are the understanding and the will; and his latter gifts are not revocations of those excellent ones, but are vouchsafed so as to direct and draw, though not totally to supersede them. We are commanded to believe and to repent (1 John, ii. 23; and Acts, xvii. 13); which commandment is an address to our faculty of optional exertion. God commands his people to MAKE THEMSELVES a new heart (Ezek. xviii. 30, 31; Isaiah, i. 16); and *because* he worketh in us, we are, *therefore*, to work out our own salvation (Philip. ii. 12, 13). There may be some few passages which seem, when considered by themselves, to represent God as the sole agent in renewing the heart; but there are others capable of being singled out by the Socinians as attributing the same province exclusively to man. Since Scripture, then, cannot contradict itself, we must infer co-operation on the self-same ground on which we maintain the doctrine of the Trinity. Some texts represent our Lord as God; others as man: he is, therefore, God and man. In both cases the conclusion contended for is the only hypothesis which embraces all the

facts *. If it be said, that to assume co-operation introduces boasting before God, in whose sight no flesh should glory (1 Cor. i. 29), nay, boasting conversion to be partly by works, contrary to the affirmation of Scripture (Ephes. ii. 9), I answer, that all glory is attributed to God, as the author and giver of salvation ; while we acknowledge also our good works to be actuated by his Spirit, and not to be performed by our own strength. It is also of grace that our imperfect works are accepted. There is a glorying in obedience (1 Cor. ix. 15, 16), though not in the merit or sufficiency of works as independent of grace, and as superseding faith (Rom. iii. 37 ; iv. 2 ; and 1 Cor. i. 29, 31).

* The two passages, Ephes. ii. 8, " By grace ye are saved through faith, &c." and Rom. vi. 23, " The gift of God is eternal life ;" may be explained by Matt. vii. 14 ; Heb. x. 20 ; and Acts, xvi. 17. The former imports, By grace ye have the power of being saved through faith ; and the latter, The gift of God is the way of eternal life †.

" By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, &c." *Kαὶ τὸτο* is considered by Mr. Faber as referring not to FAITH, as the gift of God, but to the whole sentence ; for, although faith be the gift of God in one sense, as EVERY good and perfect gift is from above, this text does not entirely exclude the power of assent to or dissent from the doctrines proposed to our faith, and of acceptance or rejection of the grace OFFERED ‡. Mr. Faber, by the way, is understood to be one of those mulattoes, the moderate Calvinists ; but if these be indeed his real sentiments, he is not half so good a Calvinist as Mahomet was.

† See Tomline's Refut. p. 40.

‡ Faber on the Calvin. and Armin. Controv.

Christ often commends human actions, and will say to his people at the last day, "Well done, good and faithful servants." This is wholly absurd, if they did nothing well. Our faith will be found to our praise and glory, &c. at the revelation of Jesus Christ (1 Pet. i. 9, 10).

It is nowhere asserted in Scripture, that man, by the fall of Adam, is wholly incapacitated from contributing any thing towards the work of his own conversion; on the contrary, the wickedness of man is imputed to his want of consideration—to his voluntary evil habits—to his unwillingness to do what he knows to be his duty; and what, with the help tendered to him, he is capable of doing. The sinner's impenitence is either the fault of God, who refuses sufficient grace; or of himself, by voluntary rejection of sufficient grace vouchsafed. In this latter case, rejection implies a power of acceptance; in other words, it implies co-operation. But that God is not in fault, is clearly evident from the passages, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thy help" (Hosea, xiii. 9); "Why will ye die, O house of Israel?" (Ezek. xxxiii. 11); "What could have been done more for my vineyard, which I have not done in it? saith the Lord: wherefore, when I looked that it should have brought forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?" (Isa. v. 4). The persons here spoken of did not repent. Yet sufficient grace was offered on the part of God for their repentance. They were impenitent through their resistance of suffi-

cient grace. Grace, therefore, is resistible. Now, resistance of sufficient grace is only, in other words, the voluntary refusal of co-operation. It therefore implies co-operation. Again; "Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life." What sense, what meaning, could be intimated by these words, if grace were really irresistible? Instead of chiding the Jews for not being willing to come to him, God could have only to vouchsafe such a measure of impulse as should effectually force them to come unto him. Here let it be observed, that the reproach is conveyed to these men, not (as in the former case) for their REJECTION of grace, but for their want of exerting SOME GOOD PRINCIPLE of their nature, to embrace sufficient grace vouchsafed. Man, therefore, is not totally depraved. He is a moral agent in his own conversion. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest ill, sin lieth at thy door" (Gen. iv. 7). "Behold, I set before you a blessing and a curse; a blessing if you will obey, &c." (Deut. xi. 26). "When the wicked man turneth from his wickedness, he shall live" (Ezek. xviii. 28). Also 2 Chron. xv. 2; Matt. vii. 7, 8; Luke, xi. 13; Matt. xxv. 14; Luke, viii. 18; Rom. viii. 13; Col. i. 29, and Rom. vii. all imply a power of exertion in man, and voluntary steps to be taken for rendering effectual the gift of the Spirit. In the parable of the sower there is plainly manifested a certain moral *susceptibility* to receive

grace. The righteousness of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Job, under the law, evinces, at least, the possibility of some moral efforts. Several conversions also, related in the New Testament, were effected through the medium of moral persuasion, and not wholly by supernatural impulse. Such was that of the three thousand souls on the day of Pentecost, which resulted from the sermon of Peter. In Ephes. i. 13, we read of disciples, whose faith preceded their being sealed with the Holy Ghost *.

“Quench not the Spirit” (1 Thes. v. 19); “Grieve not the Spirit” (Ephes. iv. 30); “Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost” (Acts, vii. 51), are texts evincing the resistibility of sufficient grace vouchsafed; and as resistance is voluntary refusal of co-operation, they are texts implying a POWER of co-operation. But lest the Calvinist should object, that this power of rejection implies not a power of voluntary acceptance; or, in his own phraseology (misapplied in the circumstances before us, of sufficient grace vouchsafed), we have power to ruin ourselves, but no power to help ourselves; we ask, whether the power of active acceptance be not expressed in the words, “Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man WILL hear my voice, and will open the door, I will come in unto him, and sup with him, and he with me” (Rev. iii. 20). The active exertion of

* We here affirm, not that the Holy Spirit was not concerned in these conversions, but that he was not the sole operator. The understanding may have been INCLINED, yet was self-exerted.

the soul, for the production of good, in conjunction with the Spirit of God, is also very explicitly stated in the passages, "The Spirit bearing witness with our spirits that we are the children of God" (Rom. viii. 16); and, "It is God who worketh in you both to will and to do; wherefore work out your own salvation" (Phil. ii. 12, 13); "God will not suffer you to be tempted above what ye can bear; wherefore flee from idolatry" (1 Cor. x. 13, 14); "Draw nigh unto God, and he will draw nigh unto you" (James, iv. 8). Spiritual influence, in short, is not the driving whirlwind; it is the soft and gentle gale, by which the vessel is not necessarily forced, yet without which she cannot proceed: the gale which, if she spreads forth her inviting canvass, will waft her to her destined haven. It is not the fortunate seasons of those green isles of the south, which, while man slumbers in the lap of voluptuous indolence, will ripen for him the fruits of the earth; it is the genial warmth, the summer suns, the showers dropping fatness of these higher latitudes, which, though indispensable to the production of the harvest, would be wasted without the tillage of man*.

* Grace, we have already shown, signifies favour: now, it is declared, that the grace of God hath appeared unto ALL men (Tit. ii. 11); but if it be beneficial only to the elect, and to the remainder of mankind no grace or favour at all, how could favour be said to have appeared unto ALL men?

The ancient fathers deliver express and frequent declarations of the power of man to choose the good and to refuse the evil.

4. Is grace partial in regard to times as well as to persons? is the next question to be discussed. "All," say the Calvinists, and this is their fourth point, "all whom God hath predestinated unto life, he is pleased, in his appointed time, effectually to call, by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation, by Jesus Christ." The fourth Arminian article, according to Mosheim, is, that divine grace, or the energy of the Holy Ghost, begins and perfects every thing that can be called good in man; and consequently, all good works are to be attributed to God alone; that, nevertheless, this grace is offered to all, and does not force men to act against their inclinations, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner. As this statement, however, seems not exactly to meet the terms of the antagonist Calvinistic point, I shall propose, that to the phrase "grace is offered to all," be added the words, "and offered at all times*."

Dr. Whitby, in his discourse on the fourth point, cites the opinions of Justin Martyr and Irenæus. St. Austin saith, "It is the height of madness and injustice to hold any person guilty because he did not that which he could not do." Origen and all the fathers are of the same sentiment †.

* The two books already mentioned, Gregory and Evans, only affirm, that there is no such thing as irresistible grace in the conversion of sinners.

† Whitby.

All scriptural exhortations, supposing a WILL in man, must militate against the notion of an effectual special call, at the good time of God; because THEN the will is supposed to be invincibly forced, and there is no need of exhortation: and at all other times, it is agreed on both sides, that the will of man can do nothing, without the grace of God preventing and assisting it; and since effectual grace is assumed to be then withheld, exhortations addressed to the will were idle and absurd, because utterly unavailing. If no man can be converted sooner than he is; what can import the inquiries, “How long refuse ye to keep my commandments? &c.” (Exod. xvi. 28; Numb. xiv. 11; Jerem. iv. 14.) How shall we reconcile to reason the passages, 2 Cor. ix. 7; Phil. xiii. 14; 1 Peter, v. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 37; ix. 1, 3, 4; in which a distinction is drawn between duties performed willingly and of necessity? How vain to the elect, who cannot repent before the good time of God; and at that good time must repent, *volentes nolentes*: how false and hypocritical to the reprobate, who are supposed to have been previously disabled from ever repenting, must be all general exhortations to repentance! To the reproach, “Ye will not come unto me that you might have life” (John, v. 40), the elect might reply, “We were waiting for thy fore-appointed time;” and the reprobate, “How

COULD we come, when our coming was forbidden from the beginning ?”

In truth, God is continually calling men to repentance ; and his calls imply a continual power in his creatures to touch, at all times, the golden sceptre of his favour. In the dispensations of Providence, in the plaudits and rebukes of conscience, in sickness, in afflictions, in the funerals of friends, in Sabbath cessations of labour, in the invitations and warnings of public instruction, the still small voice of the Holy Ghost is ever raised, beseeching transgressors to return, without delay, unto God. What is every additional notch which marks the calendar of our years ; what is every chiming of the bells which summon us to church ; what is every diseased organ, which announces decay and dissolution, but a call ? and a call for the neglect of which we must answer. Will the Calvinist, then, still set up his idle, unfounded distinction between a general and a special, an ordinary and an effectual call ? Any man, at any moment, may make the general call a special one ; and render ordinary spiritual influences effectual in his own case. To-day, if ye will hear the voice of the celestial Spirit (to-day, then, and every day, his voice may be heard), harden not your hearts *. And of to-day, and of every day, may it be truly affirmed, “Behold, this is the accepted time ; this is the day of salvation” (Psalm xcv. 7, 8 ; Heb. iii. 15 ; 2 Cor. vi. 2).

* Heb. iii. 7, 8.

Under this supposition of a special call to be effected in God's good time, every unconverted man, waiting for this special call, would be placed exactly in the situation deprecated by the Apostle: "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" Nor do I see very clearly why I should say, God forbid, if I were certain of the abundance of saving grace at the last. But we know that the wicked man shall save his soul alive, when (when-ever) he turneth away from his wickedness; and, accordingly, the prodigal arose and went to his father; and was received, on the instant, with tenderness and indulgence.

5. It now only remains for us to consider the last point of Calvinism, namely, the *Perseverance of the Saints*. Those, it is said, whom God hath effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, shall never finally fall from a state of grace. Partially, indeed, they may fall, and for a season; but they are recovered by sermons, prayers, devout exercises; and it is impossible they should ultimately perish.

In opposition to this daring sentiment the Arminians maintain, that the regenerate may lose true justifying faith, fall from a state of grace, and die in their sins.

Now, let any man begin by examining the various passages collected by the disciples of Calvin, to support their opinion, Jer. xxxii. 40; Mark,

xvi. 16; John, iv. 14; vi. 40; xvii. 3; 1 John, iii. 9; ii. 19; Jude, 24, 25; and he will find that all of them fail to establish the point laid down; intimating, either that believers continue in a state of salvation so long as they believe, and use the means of perseverance, a truism which no Arminian denies; or, instead of teaching a *certain* restoration from lapse, seeming to preclude the righteous from the possibility of ever falling; a literal construction, which even Calvinists deny to be the true one.

Exhortations to steadfastness and faithfulness unto death, accompanied with promises made to them that overcome (1 Cor. xv. 58; vii. 37; Heb. xxx. 14; Rev. ii. 10), insinuate the possibility of falling totally from a state of grace. For God cannot be supposed to have first predetermined the certain perseverance of some, and then to have suspended their happiness on the contingency of their perseverance (Matt. xxiv. 12—14; Rev. ii. 10). By parity of reasoning, the same observation is applicable to all *cautions* directing Christians not to fall away (Luke, xxi. 34, 36), especially when accompanied with threats of punishment to backsliding (Heb. iii. 12, 14*). This is strengthened into an assurance by the Prophet Ezekiel, xviii. 24, who affirms, that “when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness,

* See also 26 ver. xxxiii. 13, 18.

and committeth iniquity, all his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned; in his sin that he hath sinned he shall die:" and by St. Paul, who acquaints the Hebrews, vi. 4, 56, that men who have tasted of the heavenly gift, and been partakers of the Holy Ghost, may so fall away as to render it impossible to renew them again by repentance. Again, after declaring that the just shall live by faith (Heb. x. 38), the same Apostle adds, "but if he draw back (*any man* is not in the original), my soul shall have no pleasure in him" (ver. 39) *. If we sin willingly, (that is, fall away from grace, not slip into unpremeditated infirmities), after having received the knowledge of the truth, &c. there remaineth only fiery indignation; nay, a severer punishment than even the death inflicted on the transgressors of the Mosaic law. Again, there are men who have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of our Saviour Christ; yet whose latter end is worse than their beginning (2 Peter, ii. 18, 20, 22).

The servant in the Gospel, whose debt was at first forgiven, was, on his subsequent misconduct, delivered over unto the tormentors (Matt. xviii. 34, 35).

The seed which fell on a rock, and was WITHER-ED, is compared to those which for a while BE-

* See also Heb. x. 26—29.

LIEVE, and in time of temptation fall away (Luke, viii. 13). Now, before their final restoration can be made out, it must be shown, that the withered plant can raise its head on the stalk, and recover the beauty and freshness of its petals. And it is evident that some, who had obtained previous faith, and divine power (2 Peter, i. 1, 3), might fall into positive destruction (2 Peter, iii. 16, 17). Nay, St. Paul himself, converted, called, chosen to be an Apostle, expressed his doubts as to his own final perseverance. "I labour, lest by any means, when I have preached to others, I should myself be a cast-away" (1 Cor. ix. 27).

Persons are mentioned in Scripture, who are given over to a reprobate mind; that is, from whom spiritual influences, once possessed, are withdrawn. "Cast me not away from thy presence," said David; "take not thy holy Spirit from me;" words implying a present possession of that Spirit, and a dread of losing it irrecoverably*.

This doctrine of final perseverance is a corollary from that of absolute election; and is equally inconsistent with the wisdom and holiness of God; with the probationary condition of man; and (since it were ridiculous to pray for that which has been predetermined unalterably from all eternity) with prayers for the intercession of Christ, or for illapses of spiritual succour.

* See also Colos. i. 23; Heb. iii. 12, 14.

Again, it is part of the Calvinistic doctrine, that the impossibility of falling away depends not on the strength and steadfastness of the renewed mind, slightly vulnerable, but instantly healing, like the wounds of Milton's angels, but purely on the promises of God, who hath absolutely predestined them, do what they will, to be saved. They may be drunken, like Noah; incestuous, like Lot; murderers and adulterers, like David; idolaters, like Solomon; deniers of God, with oaths and imprecations, like Peter; and all this, in repeated instances, and for a lengthened and almost indefinite time; yet their ultimate recovery, pardon, acceptance, and salvation, are matters beyond the possibility of a doubt. Now, to say nothing of the door which so dreadful a conviction opens to protracted remissness, to shameless profligacy, to daring and unreserved impiety; to say nothing of its inspiring the vicious with false hopes, vain presumptions, and blasphemous fancies; let it suffice to remark, first, that, under the supposition here stated, arguments drawn for ultimate perseverance, from the texts Psalm i. 2, 3; Matt. vii. 24, 25; Rom. vi. 2; 1 John, v. 4, must all be set aside, as being inapplicable to the case of those in whom good dispositions die away; and as proving only, that they who persevere in general good dispositions; who, like the good ground, receive the word of God, and keep it, shall continue in the favour of God; and,

2dly, That voluntarily and deliberately to fall away, under the absolute CERTAINTY of restoration, is in direct opposition to all such passages as the following: "He that is born of God, sinneth not, neither can sin: he keepeth himself so, that the wicked one toucheth him not" (1 John, iii. 9; v. 18); and, "The Lord is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil" (2 Thess. iii. 3): passages to be explained below.

Besides exhibiting the practicability of falling finally from a state of grace, the Sacred Writings present examples of some persons who have actually made shipwreck concerning faith (1 Tim. i. 19); and of others removed from Him that called them through the grace of Christ (Gal. i. 6, 7).

1. It is objected, however, by the Calvinists, that "Christ loved his own unto the end" (John, xiii. 1). But these words, in their place, manifestly import no more, than that he loved his Apostles unto the close of his life. 2. "False Christs shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect" (Matt. xxiv. 24). From this phrase, it is pretended, we gather, that such alienation is impossible. But if this were really the case, to what purpose his exhortations, "to take heed lest any man deceive them?" (Matt. xxiv. 4, 5; Mark, xiii. 29.) Besides, "if it be possible," denotes difficulty, but not impossibility. Thus St. Paul "hastened, if it were possible, to be at Jerusalem before Pentecost" (Acts, xx. 16). 3. "Every true believer in Christ shall have everlasting life"

(John, vi. 39, 40) ; but this he can only have by the ultimate perseverance contended for. This has been already answered. So long as true belief continues, so long is there a hope of salvation. And that belief may NOT persevere, and that thus salvation may be lost, is manifest from a variety of exhortations to persevering faith, some of them suspending salvation on the condition of that perseverance, which are scattered through the Epistles and Gospels. “ They shall be saved if they continue in the faith” (1 Tim. ii. 15 *). 4. “ Whom God justifies, them he also glorifies ; and nothing can separate them from the love of God” (Rom. viii. 29, 39). “ He hath glorified,” is here construed by the Fathers, He hath made glorious, by the gift of his Holy Spirit, as an earnest of their future glory. The other expression, “ Who shall separate us from the love of Christ ?” implies only a determined steadfastness, but not a superiority to the danger of falling away ; for they cannot contradict exhortations penned by the same Apostle. 5. “ He that is born of God cannot sin” (1 John, iii. 9). This, if taken literally, ought to preserve the elect in a state of sinless obedience. But it can only mean, that, as born of God, the converted man cannot deliberately and fearlessly deliver himself up unto

* See also John, viii. 30 ; Col. i. 23 ; Heb. iii. 6, 14 ; Rom. ii. 21, 22 ; 1 John, ii. 24.

The passage, Rom. xi. 2, refers to the Jewish people.

sin; which he might do, if he were sure of being restored. 6. To the texts, 1 Cor. i. 9, 10; x. 13; Phil. i. 6; 1 Thes. v. 23, 24; 2 Thes. iii. 3, it is generally replied, that God is frequently said, in Scripture, to do a thing, when he only does what has a strong tendency to the accomplishment, as in Ezek. xxiv. 13.

When we come to take a wide view of the inspired volume, we find not one promise, that particular persons, falling into great or habitual transgressions, shall assuredly be restored by an unavoidable repentance. We may add, that the concurrent testimony of all antiquity is adverse to the doctrine of indefectible perseverance*.

IV. It seemed necessary to compare, in this

* Bishop Tomline, in his Refutation, cites an abundant number of passages from Ignatius and Clement of Rome, contemporaries of the Apostles; from Justin Martyr, A.D. 140; Tatian, A.D. 172; Irenæus, A.D. 178; Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194; Tertullian, A.D. 200; Origen, A.D. 230; Cyprian, A.D. 248; Lactantius, A.D. 306; Eusebius, A.D. 315; Athanasius, A.D. 326; Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 348; Hilary, A.D. 354; Epiphanius, A.D. 368; Basil, A.D. 370; Gregory of Nazianzum, A.D. 370; Gregory of Nyssa, A.D. 370; Ambrose, A.D. 374; Jerome, A.D. 392; Augustine, A.D. 398; Chrysostom, A.D. 398, and Theodoret, A.D. 423; all asserting the doctrines of universal redemption, freewill as concurring with grace, and predestination upon prescience.

The anticalvinistic opinions of all the Fathers prior to Augustine, are acknowledged, indeed, by Calvin himself: "Quod ingenue fateor, ne quis causæ nostræ magnopere obfuturum confidat, si eorum nomina contra opponantur †."

† Calv. Instit. lib. iii. ch. 23.

place, the doctrines of Calvin and Arminius, not only because they constitute the parent stocks from which various denominations of Christians, in England, have branched out, but also for the better understanding of a question which has, of late years, been agitated with much violence, namely, which of these two contending doctrines are illustrated by the Articles, the Liturgy, and the Homilies of the English Church. A large body of dissenters, consisting chiefly of the Whitfield Methodists, agree with a certain portion of the clergy within the pale of the establishment, in pronouncing Calvinism to be the basis of its public confessions. This opinion they have endeavoured to substantiate, by maintaining, that the original framers of these confessions were men of Calvinistic sentiments; and that the documents in question speak further for themselves, by breathing the pure principles of Calvinism. It will be proper, then, to examine the weight of these two positions: Were the sentiments of those who framed the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, Calvinistic? and, Are these documents themselves Calvinistic?

No doubt, the answer to the former of these inquiries will have considerable influence in determining the result of the latter; for it is hardly to be supposed, that men of principle would contribute their aid towards the drawing up of a rule for public faith, worship, and instruction, without forming it in consonance with their personal con-

victions. Yet even here, were it necessary, we might subjoin, as a note, that although they could not be expected to write in contrariety to their private sentiments, they might so far suppress their peculiarities, and generalize the formularies to be subscribed, as to open a door to the concurrence of men agreeing in the basis of a common faith, but differing with respect to less essential particulars. We speak not, now, with reference to the case before us, concerning the wisdom or unadvisableness of such a measure; we speak not respecting such a measure as a matter of fact. We are supposing it merely possible; and be it remembered, that this possibility of framing documents aiming at comprehension and peace, subsists, as well when the framers are held to be Arminians, as when their principles are conceived to have been Calvinistic.

It will likewise greatly assist us in our inquiry to recollect, that at the time when the formularies under examination were drawn up, the errors of the Romish church, from whose yoke the Reformation had recently escaped, were the grand objects of dread and denunciation. Controversies are now violent, which were little considered by the reformers; and men ought to be cautioned against the absurdity of expecting that the Articles and other forms should determine with prophetic foresight all disputed points which might come to be agitated throughout succeeding ages.

Cranmer and Ridley, assisted by the other

bishops, and chiefly by Latimer and Hooper, first framed the *Articles*, 1552, in the reign of Edward VI. After their repeal in the time of persecution, they were republished by Elizabeth, under the auspices of the anti-puritan Parker; having undergone some slight alterations, and a reduction from forty-two to thirty-nine (1562 and 1571). It has been shown, in the preceding volume, that the three omitted articles contained nothing bearing at all upon the point in question; and that the trivial corrections were not Calvinistic. Cranmer and Ridley were chiefly concerned in drawing up the *Liturgy*, 1548; and in revising it, with the counsel of Bucer and Martyr, in 1552; the few subsequent changes being designed to conciliate the Catholics, or to supply deficiencies in general discipline and worship. The first book of *Homilies* was published in 1547, chiefly the composition of Cranmer; the second book, probably written by Jewel, appeared not until 1560.

The question, therefore, relates to the sentiments entertained by Cranmer and Ridley; by Latimer and Hooper; and in relation to the last book of *Homilies*, by Jewel. Now, the sentiments of these divines may be best inferred from their publications. In the *Erudition of a Christian Man*, their joint work, or perhaps that of *Cranmer* alone, we meet with the following passages, irreconcilable to Calvin's doctrines of unconditional decrees, predestination to destruction, and the partial offer

of redemption: "God is naturally good, and will have ALL men to be saved, and careth for them; and provideth all things by which they may be saved, except by their own malice they will do evil, and so by righteous judgment of God perish and be lost: for truly men be to themselves the authors of sin and damnation. God is neither author of sin, nor the cause of damnation; and yet doth he most righteously damn those men, that do with vices corrupt their nature, which he made *good*, and do abuse the same to evil desires, against his most holy will: wherefore men be to be warned that they do not impute to God their vice, or their damnation, but to themselves, which by FREE-WILL have abused the GRACE and benefit of God."—"It is to be considered, that although our Saviour Christ hath offered himself upon the cross, a sufficient redemption and satisfaction for the sins of ALL the world, and hath made himself an open way and entry unto God the Father, for ALL MANKIND, only by his worthy merit and deserving; and, willing ALL MEN to be saved, calleth upon ALL THE WORLD, WITHOUT RESPECT OF PERSONS, to come and be partakers of the righteousness, peace, and glory which is in him; yet for all this benignity and grace, showed *universally to the whole world*, none shall have the effect of the benefit of our Saviour Christ, and enjoy everlasting salvation by him, but they that take such ways to attain the same, as he hath

taught and appointed in his Holy Word.”—
 “And here all fantastical imagination, curious reasoning, and vain trust of predestination, is to be laid apart. And according to the plain manner of speaking and teaching of Scripture in innumerable places, we ought to be evermore in dread of our own frailty and natural pronity to fall into sin, *and not to assure ourselves that we be elected otherwise than by feeling of SPIRITUAL motions in our heart, and by the tokens of GOOD AND VIRTUOUS LIVING*, in following the grace of God, and persevering in the same to the end.”

A few citations from the works of *Ridley* shall be here produced, in order to show his opinions separately and distinctly.

The first sentence of the argument of the Epistle to the Ephesians, on which he published a commentary in 1540, begins as follows: “In this Epistle the Apostle Paul sheweth the abundant goodness of God to ALL MEN; how he hath created and made all men, chosen and elected them (i. e. all men) to eternal life and glory, and to be heirs of the celestial kingdom, only of his mere mercy and grace, &c.”

And the second is like unto it: “ALL MEN, both Jews and Gentiles, have their sins clearly forgiven for Christ’s sake alone, and be made right heirs of the heavenly inheritance, through faith in Christ Jesus, which faith is received by the word of God preached unto them.”

“Who be elected of God, and who be not, we cannot tell, but by the outward works that they do*.”

“St. Paul saith, that God hath elected and chosen us to be holy before him in love; that is, WHOSOEVER WILL be holy, and give themselves to serve God, and to keep his commandments, &c. †”

“God is not the author of evil (James, i.). God willeth no sin. He willeth that ALL MEN should be saved—(Could he will one way and decree another?)—and come to the knowledge of the truth; therefore, they that perish and shall be damned, by their own fault they perish and be damned, and not by any fault in God; which willeth every man to be saved, and to that end he commandeth the Gospel to be preached unto all creatures, that they should believe and follow the Gospel in life, and be saved; and they who despise it are the cause of their own death ‡.”

“As for the words of Ecclesiastes, ix. that no man can know whether he is worthy of hatred or love, they relate to this life. I would that EVERY MAN should not only think that he is in the favour of God, but also know it surely that God favoureth him, &c. §”

Hooper published his “Declaration of the Ten Commandments,” in 1549; and, three years af-

* Fathers of Eng. Church, vol. ii. p. 31. † Ib. p. 31.

‡ Ib. p. 38.

§ Ib. p. 41.

terwards, in 1552, he subscribed the thirty-nine articles as Bishop of Gloucester. His assent may be received as the sincere dictate of his conviction: for his scrupulous opposition to the surplice, a matter of very inferior consequence, shows that he was not a man to subscribe, through mere compliance with the times. The following passages, extracted from the Declaration, will sufficiently manifest his sentiments: "It is not a Christian's part, to say God hath wrote fatal laws, as the Stoics, and, with necessity of destiny, pulleth one, by the hair, unto heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into hell."—"The cause of any man's rejection, or damnation, is sin in man, who will not hear, nor receive the promises of the Gospel; or else, after he hath received it, by accustomed doing ill, falleth either into a contempt of the Gospel, or hateth it, because it condemneth his ungodly life; and would there were neither God nor Gospel, to punish him for doing of ill. This sentence is true, howsoever men judge of predestination. God is not the cause of sin, nor *would have any man to sin.* 'Thou art not 'the God that willeth sin,' Psalm v. 4. And it is said, 'Thy perdition, O Israel, is of thyself, and 'thy succour only of me,' Hosea, xiii. 9."—"We judge of election by the event or success that happeneth in the life of man, those only to be elected that apprehend the mercy promised in Christ," &c.—"Being admonished, therefore, by Scripture,

we must leave sin, and do the works commanded of God; or else it is a carnal opinion that we have blinded ourselves withal, of fatal destiny, and yet will not save us. And in case there follow not in our knowledge of Christ amendment of life, it is *not lively faith that we have*, but rather a vain knowledge, and mere presumption."—"John saith (vi. 44), 'No man cometh unto me, except my Father draw him.' Many men understand these words in a wrong sense; as though God *required, in a reasonable man, no more than in a dead pot*: and mark not the words that follow; 'Every man that heareth and learneth of my Father, cometh unto me.' God draweth with his word, and the Holy Ghost; but man's duty is to hear and learn; that is to say, receive the grace of God, consent to the promise, and not repugn the God that calleth. God doth promise the Holy Ghost unto them that ask him, and not to them that contemn him." Again, after showing, that as Adam's sin extended to all and every of his posterity, so did the promise of grace in Christ generally appertain, as well to every and single of Adam's posterity, as to Adam (thus asserting universal redemption through Christ), he goes on to explain himself as follows: "Further, St. Paul doth by collation of Adam and Christ, sin and grace, thus interpret God's promise, and maketh not Christ inferior to Adam, nor grace unto sin. If all, then, shall be saved, what is to be said of

those that St. Peter speaketh of, ‘that shall perish for their false doctrine?’ and, likewise, Christ saith, ‘That the gate is strait that leadeth unto life, and few enter.’ Thus the Scripture answereth, that the promise of grace appertaineth to every sort of man in the world, and comprehendeth them all, howbeit within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect and pass over, they EXCLUDE THEMSELVES from the promise in Christ, as Cain was no more excluded, till he excluded himself, than Abel,” &c.

Calvin wrote, “Nunc de reprobis, &c. At enim Jacob, nihildum bonis operibus promeritus, assumitur in gratiam; sic Esau, nullo adhuc scelere inquinatus, odio habetur.”—“Quam nihildum boni aut mali designassent, alterum electum, alterum rejectum, &c.” Institutio, lib. iii. cap. 22, § 11.

But Hooper clears up this point, by stating, “Howbeit these threatenings of God against Esau, if he had *not, of his wilful malice, excluded himself* from the promise of grace, should no more have hindered his salvation than God’s threatenings against Nineveh, which, notwithstanding that God said it should be destroyed within forty days, stood a great time after, and did penance.”

These testimonies speak for themselves. Do they whisper, do they not rather positively oppose, the doctrines of particular and partial redemption?

Let us now ascertain the sentiments of *Lati-*
mer on these important points, by a similar se-
 lection of passages from his writings. "Some
 vain fellows" (Second Sermon on Septuagesima
 Sunday, p. 325), "seeking carnal liberty, when
 they read these words, 'Many are called, but few
 chosen,' make their reckoning thus: Need I mor-
 tify my body with abstaining from all sin and
 wickedness? I perceive God hath chosen some,
 and some are rejected. Now, if I be in the num-
 ber of the chosen, I cannot be damned; but if I
 be accounted one of the condemned number, then
 I cannot be saved. For God's judgments are im-
 mutable. Such foolish and wicked reasons some
 have, which bringeth them either to desperation,
 or else to carnal liberty. Therefore, it is needful
 to beware of such reasons or expositions of Scrip-
 ture, as it is to beware of the devil himself."

"We read in the Apostles (Acts, xiii. 48), that
 when St. Paul had made a long sermon at Antioch,
 there believed as many as were ordained to life
 everlasting; the which saying, a great number of
 people have been offended with, and have said,
 We perceive that only those shall come to believe,
 and so to everlasting life, which are chosen of God
 unto it; therefore, it is no matter whatsoever we
 do; for if we be chosen to everlasting life, we shall
 have it; and so they have opened to themselves a
 door of all wickedness and carnal liberty, against

the true meaning of the Scripture. For if the most part be damned, the fault is not in God, but in themselves; for it is written, GOD WOULD THAT ALL MEN SHOULD BE SAVED; but they themselves procure their own damnation, and despise the passion of Christ, by their own wicked and inordinate living. Here we may learn to keep us from all curious and dangerous questions. When we hear that some be chosen and some be damned, let us have good hope that we shall be amongst the chosen; and live after this hope, that is, uprightly and godly, and then thou shalt not be deceived. Think that God hath chosen those that believe in Christ, and that Christ is the book of life. If thou believest in him, then thou art written in the book of life, and so shalt be saved. So we need not go about to trouble ourselves with curious questions of the predestination of God; but let us rather endeavour, ourselves, that we may be in Christ; for when we be in him, then we be well; and then we may be sure that we are ordained unto everlasting life." (Sermon on Third Sunday after Epiphany, p. 311, 312.)

He asserts universal redemption in several of his sermons; and in that for the Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity, he acknowledges the same in the following words: "Christ shed as much blood for Judas, as for Peter. Peter believed it, and therefore he was saved; Judas would not believe

it, and therefore he was condemned ; the fault being in him only, and in nobody else *."

Once more Latimer writes, " His salvation is sufficient to save all mankind ; but we are so wicked of ourselves, that we refuse the same when it is offered to us ; and, therefore, he saith, ' Few ' are chosen ;' that is, few have pleasure or delight in it."

Thus it is manifest that Calvinism did not prevail amongst our reformers, the composers of our public formularies, in the reign of Edward, when those formularies were composed.

But further ; soon after Edward the Sixth's establishment on the throne, a Paraphrase of the New Testament was ordered, by authority, to be

* On this passage, Toplady, in his *Historic Proof*, vol. i. p. 315, has penned the following comment : " Not that Christ actually died for Judas (whose death was prior to that of Christ himself), but that the Mediator's blood was as much sufficient (so infinite was its value) to have redeemed even Judas (had it been shed for that purpose), as to have redeemed any other person."

Now, to pass by the doubtful fact, that Judas slew himself antecedently to the crucifixion of Christ, and the inference built upon it, that therefore Christ did not die for Judas, which would equally prove that Christ did not die for the Patriarchs, who, consequently, were saved without a Redeemer ; is this interpretation the plain meaning of Latimer's words ? If the writer thought so, it is in vain to argue with so blind a prejudice : and, if he wrote what he was sure could not possibly be true, he does not deserve an answer. Churton's *Life of Winchester*.

set up for the benefit of the people in all churches. The Institutes of Calvin had already appeared. But it was the Paraphrase of Erasmus, which our reformers selected, as proper to guide the opinions of the English public; of Erasmus, who had distinguished himself in opposition to the erroneous sentiments entertained by Calvin, on the subjects of enslaved will and absolute decrees.

Now, the advocates for a Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, finding it impossible to deny the sentiments of the early reformers to have been anti-calvinistic, when these documents were first drawn up, have shifted the untenable ground, and now as strenuously maintain, that alterations in opinion had taken place before the Articles were finally published by Elizabeth, in 1562*.

This allegation must needs allude to the sentiments either of the original composers themselves, or of those under whose auspices the Articles were republished. The original composers suffered martyrdom in the reign of Mary, 1555. In the preceding year, 1554, a dispute relative to predestination arose among these imprisoned reformers.

* Luther's Commentary on the Galatians, advancing the doctrine of the decrees, had also been published prior to the appearance of the Paraphrase. Luther afterwards changed his sentiments; "Since which time," says Burnet, "the whole stream of the Lutheran churches has run the other way." Hist. Refor. vol. ii. p. 107.

Bradford wrote a Treatise on this subject, which has been lost. A letter of his writing, however, containing a summary of his opinions, and stating the reception which his Treatise had encountered from his fellow-martyrs, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, is still extant amongst the Martyrs' Letters*.

From this letter, and some others, it appears that Bradford was what is now called a moderate Calvinist (although, I confess, that my own reason has never yet been able to annex a clear idea to that term), asserting UNIVERSAL redemption through Christ to Adam, and to ALL HIS POSTERITY who refuse it not finally; and recommending some diligence to be employed by man in the affair of his own salvation (although that were long ago fixed by an irrevocable decree). To me, who, were I a Calvinist, could not avoid being, by deduction of reason, an Antinomian, all this appears inconsistent and contradictory; but this I only mention by the way. That an assertion of universal redemption, and of election in and by Christ, accompanied with earnest exhortations to labour, is not pure Calvinism, will appear by a reference to the words of Calvin; for, as to both the elect and reprobate, he asserts the decrees to be absolute, and resolved into the sole will of God; and as to the reprobate, that they are predestinated and determined to sin, and so to damnation: "In

* Martyrs' Letters, p. 391, 409, 471, &c.

hanc pravitatem addictos, quia justo et inscrutabili Dei judicio suscitati sunt, ad gloriam ejus suâ damnatione illustrandam." Calvini Instit. lib. iii. cap. 24, § 14. And again; "Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobât; neque aliâ de causâ, nisi quod ab hæreditate quam filiis suis prædestinat, illos vult excludere." Cap. 23, § 1.

Bradford sent his Treatise to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, then prisoners at Oxford, accompanied by a letter addressed to Ridley, requesting their judgment upon the subject: *ut veritas doctrinæ maneat apud posteros.*

From Ridley's reply, it is clear that a second letter, not published among the martyrs' correspondence, had been written by Bradford, complaining that heresies had been broached among his fellow-prisoners, which had not existed, "if the request of the first letter had been granted." Now, since this request was no other than that they should assent to the opinions contained in the Treatise, the words of the lost letter, quoted by Ridley, imply, that the three bishops had not given their sanction to that work; and Ridley himself adds, that he has "great fearfulness in handling the subject, and dares not speak further than the text leads him by the hand*." Bradford, then, first upbraided the bishops for not giving his Treatise that sanction which would have patronized its appear-

* Martyrs' Letters, p. 64. Coverdale, the editor in 1564, says, in a marginal note, "The subject is God's election."

ance in the world; strangling that multitude of heresies of which he complains, in their cradle; and afterwards suppressed the work, for want of this protecting authority. Now, had these bishops framed the seventeenth article, on principles avowedly and notoriously Calvinistic, would not Bradford have urged those principles against them, on their refusing to lend their sanction to a treatise speaking the language of even moderated and diluted Calvinism? If Ridley had been a determined Calvinist, would he have spoken of his great fearfulness in handling the subject of election?

That the composers of our public formularies were not LIKELY to change their sentiments on the several points in question, is a consideration which may be added as a note to the foregoing argument. These sentiments were, in fact, not remains of the ancient superstition, but part of the system of reformation. Dean Tucker has shown, in his Letters to Dr. Kippis, p. 81, &c. that at the time just preceding the Reformation, the church of Rome, in respect to predestination, grace, free-will, and perseverance, was truly Calvinistic.

Is it likely, then, that having thus put their hand to the plough of reformation, the fathers of the English church would look back? Is it likely that men possessing minds so vigorous, would return to errors they had abjured and thrown off? Or, if they had changed their sentiments, would

they not have taken some pains, by a public recantation, to efface impressions which they now deemed erroneous? Yet nothing of the kind appears; nor did they express a wish for the alteration of the Anti-calvinistic phrases in any of those formularies which they had prescribed.

Jewel is the reputed author of the Second Book of Homilies, which appeared in 1560. It will be observed, that all the other formularies were produced antecedently to the return of the exiles from Geneva, and thus were not likely to be tainted with the waters of its lake. This alone was sent forth subsequently to that event; and, therefore, has not hitherto been examined. Now, if Jewel's religious sentiments be estimated by his Apology, it is certain that the name of Calvin does not once occur in that work. Again, Jewel, when abroad, had resided at Strasburgh and Zurich; and, on the breaking out of the troubles in Francfort, opposed himself to Knox and Goodman, who rejected the Liturgy, and the fabric of Edward the Sixth's reformation *.

In the Apology, chiefly written, indeed, against the errors of Rome, I have not been able to discover a single sentence intimating the slightest tendency to Calvinistic opinions in the writer. He speaks, it is true, incidentally of the difference between the Lutherans and Zuinglians; but this

* Life prefixed to his Apology, p. 19.

either related to the doctrine of consubstantiation; or, if the decrees were alluded to, he takes no part in the argument; speaking of the contention as slight and soon likely to be healed*; exactly as might be expected from a reformer, having his mind's eye filled with the thousand more formidable errors of the Romish communion, and urged by the natural bias of inclination to represent the Protestant church, as a body, to its adversaries, in the fairest and most favourable light.

But to elucidate more clearly the sentiments of this reformer, let the following extracts from the Apology be subjoined.

“Baptism is the sacrament of the remission of sins: and NONE are to be denied that sacrament, who will profess the faith of Christ,” &c. P. 28.

In this passage, it is evidently taken for granted, 1st, that the sins of ALL men are remitted, through the blood of Christ; and 2dly, that faith is a matter, in some measure, of human option and volition.

“To this great and solemn feast (the sacrament of the Lord's supper) the people are to be invited, that they may ALL communicate together,” &c. P. 29.

“It is finished; as if by these words he would signify, now the price is paid for the sins of MANKIND.” P. 36. *Here the expression is—not, the*

* P. 42, Translation, 1685.

price is sufficient, but paid ; i. e. mankind are redeemed ; and not a part of mankind, but mankind in general. “ Though we say there is no trust to be put in the merits of our own works and actions, and place all the hopes and reason of our salvation only in Christ, yet we do not therefore say, that men should live loosely and dissolutely, *as if baptism and faith were sufficient for a Christian ; and there were nothing more required ; the true faith is a living faith, and as St. Paul saith, unto good works.*” P. 39.

We have now shown that the Liturgy and first book of Homilies were revised and settled by those who composed them : that the sentiments of these divines were at first Anti-calvinistic, and underwent no subsequent alteration ; and that Jewel, the composer of the second book of Homilies, entertained no Calvinistic opinions. The Articles, however, composed by Cranmer and his colleagues, were revised and republished by Parker, in 1562 and 1571. It remains therefore, in order to complete our view of the opinions entertained by those who prescribed our public formularies, that the sentiments of that prelate should be shown to be Anti-calvinistic. And to this end, if to state, that his whole archiepiscopal life was a war against the Puritans, who, after the return of the exiles, were distinguished by Calvinistic sentiments ; that he ordered the Apocrypha to be read ; and that he edited the Bishops' Bible

to counteract the translation of Geneva : if all this be not deemed sufficient, his preface to the Bishops' Bible, asserting universal redemption, would of itself afford conclusive demonstration. "Search the Scriptures, &c. John, v. 39. *No man, woman, or child,*" adds he, "*is excluded from this salvation,* and therefore to every of them is this spoken*."

But indeed, whatever might have been the sentiments of Parker, they would not at all invalidate the argument derived from the opinions of the earlier reformers ; for not to mention, that they would affect the Articles alone, Parker having left untouched the Liturgy and Homilies ; the five Articles relative to grace and the decrees of God, are either the same with those agreed upon in Edward's reign ; or slightly altered, so as to fence more strongly against the doctrine of absolute predestination ; witness the addition of the last clause in the seventeenth Article.

This additional clause of precaution, referring to the general sense of Scripture, as recommending OBEDIENCE to the will of God in our DOINGS,

* Nowell has shown (Ans. to Pietas Oxon.), that the questions and answers respecting predestination, instead of being *always*, were probably never till 1615, bound up with the Bishops' Bible.

Another work chiefly the composition of Cranmer, was the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, published in 1552. It guards more explicitly than the 17th Article, against the rigid doctrine of absolute predestination.

proves that the revisers of the Articles in 1562, were, if possible, more afraid of Calvinism than even the original composers. It is therefore by recurrence to the sentiments of these composers, that the sense of the composition is to be inferred; and their sentiments have been already shown to be unfavourable to the peculiar doctrines of Geneva. Q. E. D.

Now, although to have shown the early or the later reformers to have been Calvinists, would not have been conclusive evidence of the Calvinistic sense of the formularies, since they professed to exhibit Christianity as understood by the fathers of the three first centuries, whose works contain nothing resembling the doctrines of Calvin; it may be presumed, on the other hand, that admitting the early reformers to have been Anti-calvinists, they never could have penned Calvinistical formularies.

2. But to advance from strong presumption to positive proof, let us now direct our attention to the second point to be examined: Are the formularies themselves Calvinistic?

As we have shown that these documents were not produced by Calvinistic DIVINES, it may be proper still further to prepare our way, by proving them to have been borrowed, so far as they were borrowed, from an Anti-calvinistic SOURCE.

The controversy respecting the various points disputed between the Arminians and Calvinists

appeared in the church so early as the time of Pelagius, whose impious doctrines of human merit, and the power of unassisted virtue, Augustine opposed, by starting to the opposite extreme. Thomas Aquinas, and the Thomists, his disciples, adopted the notions of Augustine; while those of Pelagius were patronised by Duns Scotus and the Scotists. The former party belonging to the Dominican, and the latter to the Franciscan order, were followed by their respective families of monks: while the Pelagian party was strengthened by the Jesuits and many others. Luther being a disciple of the Augustine school, adopted the opinions of his master. His opposition to indulgences strengthened his solifidian principles; and drove him the length of denying to good works the virtue of being either the means or condition of salvation, or even a preparation for that end. On this point, as on various others, Melancthon was of opinion, that the sentiments of his colleague ought to be mitigated; but during the life of Luther, owing to the gentleness and timidity of his character, he advanced his notions with the utmost modesty and deference*. Melancthon, after the death of his friend, became the leader of the Lutheran party, and lowered the tone of their doctrines. Excluding the *merit* of works, he taught, nevertheless, that obedience was necessary

* See Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 306, &c.

to salvation; and asserted a co-operation of the will with spiritual influences. Hence arose a distinction between high, and moderate or synergist Lutherans; and in general, when we speak of Lutherism, we speak of the opinions of Melancthon. Luther died in 1546, previous to the composition of any of our public formularies. The famous confession of Augsburg had been drawn up by the pen of Melancthon, in 1530. He was likewise the author of the Wittenberg confession, being professor of Greek in the university of that place.

“ Our Articles,” says Dr. Waterland*, “ were not drawn up according to Calvin’s scheme, but, next to Scripture and antiquity, upon the platform of the moderate Lutherans, the Augustan confession, Melancthon’s doctrine, and the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition compiled about nine years before the passing of our Articles, and by many of the same hands which concurred in the latter.”

At the time, indeed, when the Articles were drawn up, the Popish errors were almost the sole object of religious altercation; for although Protestants thought differently on various subjects, no public dissension had hitherto occurred among them, saving that upon the single point of the Eucharist†. In the year 1552, when the Articles were

* Supplement to Case of Arian Subscription.

† Lawrence’s Lectures.

compiled, the Calvinistic controversy was only commencing; and so late as 1560, it appears from the Confession of the church of Scotland, that Knox had not adopted Calvin's notion concerning election and reprobation. In the year 1555, a combination of neighbouring clergy was formed against Calvin at Geneva. It is true, indeed, that at the beginning of the Reformation, disputes *de fato* had perplexed the new doctrines, but their reign had been terminated long before the Articles were compiled. As to the Gospellers, or abusers of predestination, in the reign of Edward VI. "a scandal," as Burnet terms them, "to the doctrine they professed," they were reflected on by Hooper and other reformers, and it was against their monstrous doctrines, chiefly, that the seventeenth Article was framed.

So little known was the fame of Calvin in England, at the time of the compilation of the Articles, that one of his works was translated and published in 1549, under the following remarkable title; "*Of the Life and Conversation of a Christian Man, a right godly Treatise, written in the Latin Tongue by Master John Calvin, A Man of right excellent Learning, and of no less Conversation* *." It seems then, that his name was so little celebrated, as to stand in need of some commendation. Luther, at an earlier period, 1547, was

* Ames's Typography.

not thus announced with an indefinite article:
“The Disclosing of the Canon of the Popish Mass, with a Sermon annexed by THE famous Clerk of worthy Memory, Dr. Martin Luther.”

Dr. Lawrence, in his first Bampton lecture, sufficiently proves, that both Henry VIII. and his successor repeatedly solicited Melancthon to pass over into England, that he might assist Cranmer and his colleagues. He shows that the “King’s Book,” and the “Bishops’ Book,” which are avowedly systems of faith, breathe the spirit of the later Lutherism; that, relative to the points in controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, the contents of neither are materially different from what was subsequently inserted in the Articles; and that not only the sentiments, but many of the very expressions transferred from these books to some of the Articles, have been evidently derived from the confession of Augsburg*.

But particularly in the reign of Edward VI. Cranmer confirmed himself, in every important measure, with the counsel of Melancthon, then at the head of the Lutheran church. These two divines projected a general council of Protestants, to be held in England, for the compilation of a formulary of faith to be used by the whole reformed community. CALVIN was requested to take no share in these arrangements; though he

* Lawrence, Bampton. Lect. 1.

censured the deliberate proceedings of Cranmer, while Melancthon was continually inculcating the necessity of moderation, and of avoiding the stoical disputations “*de fato*,” which had disgraced other reformed churches. Accordingly, whatever Cranmer derived from continental churches, he borrowed from the moderate Lutherans; and Parker, soon after, followed his example.

During the primacy of this latter divine, the clergy in convocation, directed by Elizabeth to rebuild the walls of our Zion, rudely subverted by the bigotry of Mary, neglected not the venerable materials of the former fabric. The original document which they drew up, bearing their signatures, is still extant, and is nothing more than an interlined and amended copy of the formulary which had been adopted in the reign of Edward VI. Instead of extending the sense of the Articles, to make them embrace a variety of points, or comprehend different classes of subscribers, they reduced their number from forty-two to thirty-nine. Elucidations, it is true, were added in one or two instances; but these were not taken from a Zuinglian or Calvinistic creed, but from the confession of Wittemberg, of which the principles were Lutheran*.

* * From the Augsburg and Wittemberg confessions, it is shown by Dr. Lawrence that the 1st, 2d, 5th, 6th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 16th, 20th, 25th, 26th, 31st, and 34th Articles are derived †.

V. Having thus investigated the principles of the early English reformers, and ascertained that they were not likely to set forth Calvinistic formularies, let us now direct our attention to the formularies themselves. And, first, we maintain, that the ARTICLES are not Calvinistic.

The first of these in dispute is the 9th, relating to original sin. The scholastic doctrine of merit, which gave rise to the Catholic presumption of supererogatory works, is repugnant to reason, and contradicted by Scripture; and thus justly demanded the animadversion of reformers taking reason and Scripture for their guides. The Catholics were of opinion, that the inheritance of original sin communicated only a corporeal taint, and that the soul issues pure from the hands of her Creator. In opposition to this error the 9th Article was drawn up. According to the church of Rome, original sin was the fuel of evil, but was not displeasing unto God, till it broke out into actual crimes. The doctrine of the 9th Article

We subjoin Melancthon's opinion respecting the fifth Calvinistic point.

“Breviter refutandi sunt duo errores fanaticorum hominum, qui finxerunt renatos non posse labi, et quamvis labantur contra conscientiam, tamen justos esse. *Hæc amentia damnanda est*, et opponenda exempla et dicta Scripturæ: ut Saul et David placuerunt Deo, fuerunt justi, et donati Spiritu Sancto; tamen postea lapsi sunt, ita ut alter perierit, alter rursus ad Deum conversus sit.” *Loci Com.*

holds, that this inclination to evil is itself obnoxious to divine wrath.

One hypothesis supposes the extraordinary effusion of spiritual succour enjoyed by Adam, to have been withdrawn from him at the period of the fall ; and original sin to consist, not in an hereditary depravation of the natural faculties, but in the use of these faculties unsupported by their original aliment. Dr. Lawrence, however, contends, in his Bampton Lectures, that the nature of man itself is vitiated. And with justice : for as baptism is an act of regeneration, it would, on the first supposition, completely reinstate the soul in the condition which it had held in Adam's happier days ; whereas the 9th Article observes, justly, that the *φρονημα σαρκος* remains even in those who are baptized. That concupiscence hath the nature of sin, was a position intended to contradict an opposite assertion, advanced by the Council of Trent*. The Article under consideration, then, was not intended by the composers to combat an Anti-calvinistic opinion. As to its alleged Calvinism, we may state, that, according to Calvin, " In consequence of original sin we are actually under

* In this 9th Article, as well as in the 15th and 27th, regeneration and baptism are considered as synonymous. In the 27th, the one is described as the outward form, the other the internal, but the simultaneous effect. Hence a caution against applying the term, or idea, of regeneration, to those pretended sudden and involuntary conversions to which the fourth point of Calvinism relates.

sentence of condemnation," while the Article itself pronounces only that we deserve it*.

Again, the expression, "Very far gone from original righteousness," goes not the length of affirming that righteousness to be totally lost. Of this, indeed, the Westminster divines were fully aware, as appears by their attempting to change the "very far gone," into the less ambiguous, "totally depraved."

The 10th and 13th Articles are peculiarly claimed by the Calvinists, as favouring their views of Christianity. But, as a key to the whole, we must recur to the observation already made, namely, that the dispute referred to the opinions of the Romish church concerning human merit. Later controversialists have very unfairly regarded it as bearing solely on the doctrine of predestination †.

The expression occurring in the 10th Article, "That man cannot turn and prepare himself by his natural strength and good works," evidently illustrates this explanation.

Of the 10th Article, the first part is copied verbatim from the Wittenberg Confession, the last from a passage in the writings of St. Austin. The notion of a precise moment of sudden and involuntary renewal, the author of the Augsburg Confession condemns as a Manichean conceit and a horrible falsehood.

* Kipling on the Articles.—Lawrence, Bampton Lectures.

† See Lawrence, Bampton Lecture.

Calvin uniformly represents the Spirit of God as being the sole operator in conversion. “*Duo autem ERRORES hic cavendi sunt, quia nonnulli co-OPERARIUM DEO FACIUNT HOMINEM: ut suffragio SUO RATAM ELECTIONEM FACIANT**.” How this denunciation comports with St. Peter’s advice, “Using all diligence to make your election sure,” it is not my present business to inquire. What is the plain import of the 10th Article? is the question; and that, I think, is evident, by its stating that grace does, in fact, CO-OPERATE, or work WITH us; as well as by its twice introducing the word *will*, since, wherever there is will, there cannot be TOTAL compulsion. If grace works with our will, our will works with grace; or, in the language of the Apostle, “we are labourers together with God” (1 Cor. iii. 9). I have to subjoin, that the last words of this Article, “working with us WHEN we have that good will,” would have been more properly rendered, WHILE, or PROVIDED, we have that good will: DUM VOLUMUS.

The schoolmen were of opinion, that by good works we might attain a measure of grace sufficient to bring us unto eternal life; that it is CONGRUOUS to the Divine nature to bestow such grace; and thus, though we could not merit eternal life by our works themselves, that we could deserve grace of CONGRUITY; that is, deserve the MEANS

* Calvin, Instit. iii. 24. 3.

of attaining eternal life. They added, that we may be said, in receiving this grace, to have obtained eternal life by condignity.

Now the reformers, and our 10th, 12th, 13th, and 14th Articles, reply, that to talk of MERITING any thing at the hand of God, is blasphemy; nor is it wonderful, that when the schoolmen thus presumptuously prated of making the purest Being their debtor in grace, Luther should have charged them with sinning. These Articles, then, were all directed against scholastic boastings; which an Arminian regards with as much horror as a Calvinist. It was no part of their object, therefore, to deprecate those views of the moral agency of man, in subjection to the agency of God, which Arminius subsequently wove into a system.

To the 11th Article, concerning "*justification by faith*," similar observations are more particularly applicable. The cause of forgiveness was considered by the Roman Catholics as being, not the mercy of God in Christ, but the change operated in the individual, which rendered him worthy of divine favour. Justification by faith only, was, therefore, the antagonist doctrine of the reformers; but how little resemblance it bore to the Calvinistic opinions, may be gathered from the words of Melancthon: "*Nunc vulgare est vociferare de fide; et tamen intelligi quid sit fides, non potest, nisi prædicatâ poenitentiâ.*"

Calvin terms good works, the fruits of grace.

According to the 12th Article they are the fruits of faith. By distinguishing a true and lively faith, the 12th Article admits, that a faith may exist not true and lively. But as good works constitute the difference, these must either be optional, or no difference whatever could exist; for the grace which *forced* faith, would *force* its sincerity and liveliness*.

In the 16th Article we are taught that man **MAY** depart from grace given, and **MAY** afterwards repent †.

This expression is altogether irreconcilable to the doctrines of both irresistible and indefectible grace. For if grace were irresistible, men could not, when it is given, depart from it and fall into sin. And if the composers of the Article had intended to maintain the doctrine of indefectible grace, they would not have spoken of men generally, but of the elect; who, falling away for a time, *must* rise again, and *must* amend their lives. So sensible were the Puritans that this Article merely stated that all might resist grace, and that

* In the 11th, 12th, 13th, and 17th Articles, and indeed every where throughout our formularies, justification is spoken of as a thing already past. To be justified by faith, then, is to be accounted just, and thus to be placed in the way of salvation †.

† “To be justified by faith, then, is not to be saved by faith §.”

‡ Tomline's Refut. ch. iii. passim. § Refut. Calv. p. 137, &c.

amendment and relapse were possible, that at Hampton Court they expressed a desire to bend the Article to their own views, by adding the words, "but neither totally nor finally *." The request, however, was not complied with; and the Article and doctrine continued to deliver the language of Arminianism and reason. The word in the Latin article which speaks of a recovery from lapse is "possumus." If, therefore, we only MAY repent, we likewise MAY NOT repent; that is to say, we may fall away finally. And so falls away finally from the Church of England the reproach of encouraging presumption and of teaching nonsense.

But it is now time to examine the great subject of contention, the celebrated 17th Article. This Article was expressly drawn up in opposition to the rigid doctrines of unconditional predestination, in consequence of a correspondence between Cranmer and Melancthon. In 1548, three years before the Articles were finished, Melancthon wrote as follows in an epistle to Cranmer: "*Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes apud nostros de FATO, et disciplinæ nocuerunt. Quare te rogo, ut de tali aliquâ formulâ doctrinæ cogites.*" And the opinion of Melancthon respecting pre-

* "If the Articles are Calvinistic," says Mr. Grey, "it may be inquired, why the Calvinists petitioned against the literal and grammatical sense, on the appearance of Charles's declaration, and have so often wished to alter them †?"

† Grey, Bampton Lecture, 1796.

destination, to which this passage manifestly alludes, appears from the Augsburg Confession, in which, after affirming the promise of grace to be universal, he adds, “Nec est opus disputationibus de predestinatione, aut similibus; nam promissio est UNIVERSALIS; et nihil detrahit operibus; imo exsuscitat ad fidem, et vere bona opera*.”

Elect and reprobate are correlatives in the system of Calvin. Reprobation is not mentioned in the 17th Article. Would it have been altogether passed over, had the reformers been Calvinists, or had they intended to inculcate a Calvinistic interpretation of all the Articles?

The last clause in the 17th Article was evidently intended to fence against a Calvinistic interpretation of all which preceded; by declaring that God's promises are to be received as they are GENERALLY set forth in the Holy Scriptures. For a general view of the Scriptures is quite fatal to the doctrines of unconditional election, and the salvation of particular persons. Every page abounds with general promises, suspended on the condition of fidelity in obedience. The Gospel at large proclaims, that redemption by Christ is as general

* See Daubeny's Appendix.

Waterland and Bennett both show, that the language of Arminianism is precisely that of the 17th Article. Waterland's Supplement to Case of Arian Subscription, p. 62, &c.; Bennett's Directions, &c. p. 95. See also Playfere's Appell. ad Evang. p. 38.

as was the fall by Adam; in other words, universal *.

In a word, the 17th Article can only be reconciled with the others, with itself, with Scripture, and with the moral sense, by believing that the predestination of God was not *unconditional*, but regulated by his foreknowledge of the manner in which individuals would fulfil the stipulated conditions.

Universal redemption is very plainly taught in the 2d and 15th Articles, where “men,” and “the world,” are set down without limitation †. But, lest this should be understood as a negative argument, the 31st Article insists on the doctrine in express terms, styling Christ the redemption, &c. for ALL the sins of the WHOLE world. A difference is here to be remarked between universal redemption and universal salvation. The Calvinists deny both: Scripture, the Articles, and the moral sense, deny only the latter.

* The Gospel, which says to all men, Repent and be saved, cannot drive any to desperation. If the purpose of God were really absolute, it could be no dangerous downfall to any who should have it before their eyes, unless to those to whom it would be a downfall, even were their eyes shut to it. But the Article says it was a downfall to such; the purpose, therefore, is not absolute.

Does the Article speak any language resembling that of Calvin, “Aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna, præordinatur §?”

† In the 2d, redemption must be universal, because original guilt is universal.

§ Instit. lib. iii. cap. 21, § 5 and 7.

VI. From the Articles we pass on to an examination of the LITURGY. The very first sentence, "When the wicked man turneth away, &c." gives a blow to the total impotence of man to do any thing towards his own reformation, and to the separation of the elect at God's appointed time. The Exhortation, "Dearly beloved," invites *all* sinners to receive forgiveness of their sins; as the Communion-service repeats the words of the 31st Article, an "oblation for the sins of the whole world." The Absolution (or general remission of sins) likewise assures us, that God desireth not the death of a sinner; but Calvin says, "*Creatos destinato impios ut perirent;*" and again, "*Ipsa electio, nisi reprobationi opposita, non staret *.*"

Not to multiply quotations, the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and the Collect for the fourth Sunday after Trinity, contain a petition for life eternal. How foolish is this if the fate of every man is fore-ordained! The elect must have eternal life, pray or not pray; and the reprobate cannot obtain it, let them weary out Heaven with supplications!

We pray in the LITANY, that God would bring into the way of truth ALL such as have erred and are deceived; and also, that he would have mercy upon ALL men. But the Calvinists affirm, that he is only to have mercy upon a PART of men. According to the third Collect for Good Friday,

* Calvin. Instit. iii. 23, 1.

God is a being who willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; now, how is this reconcilable with a decree which has willed from all eternity the death of many sinners? In this same Collect, we are also made to address God as a Spirit of love, who hateth nothing that he hath made. “Reprobos Deo exosos esse,” says the gloomy and horrible doctrine of Calvin; that is, those reprobates whom he has made, and whom he has made reprobates.

In the Collect for the Sunday before Easter, Christ is said to have died, that “ALL MANKIND might follow the example of his great humility.”

What is every child instructed to repeat in his Catechism? “I believe in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and ALL MANKIND.” What says Calvin? Christ redeemed only the elect. And, in the following clause, “the Spirit sanctifieth all the elect people of God;” that is, by consequence, all who will avail themselves of his redemption, and be saved.

Again, the exposition of the Lord's Prayer in the Catechism, prescribes our expressing “a desire that the Lord God, our heavenly Father, would send his grace unto us, and unto ALL PEOPLE.” And the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, instructs us to make supplication and to give thanks for ALL MEN. Palpable contradictions and absurdities, if God has predetermined NOT to

send his grace unto all people, and to bless only a part of mankind.

Calvin's principles, if followed up, would exclude the necessity of a day of judgment; nay, he expressly denies that ALL men shall render an account. But the Athanasian Creed affirms this doctrine; and the 8th Article pronounces this Creed orthodox. Both the Creed and the Article, then, are Anti-calvinistic.

So much for the Calvinism of the Liturgy in regard to the point of partial redemption.

From the Collects for the fourth Sunday after Epiphany, where we are made to declare, that "we cannot ALWAYS stand upright;" and for the third Sunday in Lent, where we beseech God that he would look on the HEARTY desires of his humble servants, a learned refuter of Calvinism has deduced, "that man may sometimes stand upright, and that some of the desires of the human heart are such as God may regard with complacency *."

Such is the conclusion drawn by Bishop Tomline: but I am free to confess, that my mind is not quite satisfied as to the correctness of this interpretation.

It would be quite consistent with the Arminian belief to conceive, that we can NEVER stand upright without a certain impelling (though not compelling) power of divine grace; and that even our very DESIRES are the product of the same influ-

* Tomline's Refut.

ence; agreeably to Phil. ii. 13, which states, that God worketh in us both to will and to do; and to the Collects for Monday and Tuesday in Easter week, as well as several others, in which DESIRES are represented as the effect of special grace. Nay, I would mount higher: the very prayer for a good desire (if we can be supposed to pray with none, or with a faint one) is, as I conceive, not wholly spontaneous. Yet all this I must regard as being in entire and full consistence with the strict tenets of an Arminian; not excluding co-operation, that is, power of obeying or disobeying the impulse. Some one may, perhaps, here tell me, that in venturing this explanation, I am (that gross absurdity) a moderate Calvinist. And, no doubt, any one may call what names he pleases; but I know very well, that this view of the question is not Calvinism; nor do I yield the slightest assent to any one of the five points.

(This divine impulse and support, but not irresistible grace, this co-operation in short, is supposed in the Collects for the sixth Sunday after Epiphany, "Grant us, that we may PURIFY OURSELVES;" for the second Sunday after Easter, "Give us grace, that we may endeavour, OURSELVES, to follow," &c. and for the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, "Stir up the WILLS of thy people, that they may bring forth good works," &c.

In like manner the Baptismal Service acknow-

ledges the corruption of man, and the necessity for supernatural aid ; yet it implies that faith and obedience are, to a certain degree, in our own power. The matter of salvation is here represented as a compact, in which God gives forgiveness, the Holy Ghost, and the kingdom of heaven ; and the candidate, on his part, belief and obedience.

The Baptismal Service further considers EVERY child who is baptized, as elect ; and as continuing so, until he shall fall away by his own remissness : “ Grant that he MAY EVER REMAIN (continue) in the number of thy faithful and *elect* children.” All baptized children are allowed by our church to be made children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven ; and we declare, that if they die before their commission of actual sin, they are undoubtedly saved*.

But the Westminster Confession says, chap. x. § 3, ELECT infants (not all baptized infants) dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, who worketh with whom, and when, and how he pleases.

In the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, the minister is instructed to pray, that the sins of the sick man may be done away, and his pardon sealed, before he go hence ; and with what propriety could such a petition be offered by those

* Rubric, at the end of the Baptismal Service.

who believe that his pardon or *condemnation* had been sealed before the foundation of the world?

These various arguments may be summed up by a negative one, delivered by Bishop Tomline; namely, that “redemption is never declared to be irrespectively partial; that human co-operation is never excluded, when the influence of the Holy Spirit is mentioned; that grace is never stated to be irresistible or indefectible; that good works are never represented as unnecessary to salvation; and that sensible inspirations of the Spirit are no where acknowledged in our Liturgy.”

VII. No Calvinistic doctrines are inculcated in the Homilies. The word Predestination is not once to be found. The word Reprobation is not once to be found. Election occurs once only; and that in an Anti-calvinistic sense. And nothing at all is mentioned concerning absolute decrees, partial redemption, perseverance, or irresistible grace*.

There is a Homily of Justification, in which we meet with the expressions, “Forasmuch as that which men’s infirmity lacked, Christ’s justice supplied;” we must “renounce the MERIT of our virtues, as insufficient to DESERVE remission of our sins and justification; and believe in God’s mercy, through Christ to obtain forgiveness of all sins, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to him.”

* See Bishop of Lincoln’s Charge, and Refutation of Calvinism passim.

Here REPENTANCE is made a condition of justification. A Calvinist will not hear of it as a condition.

In the Homily on the Salvation of Mankind, part iii. "*baptized*" is equivalent to "*justified*." Now that baptism is regeneration, or the sign of simultaneous regeneration, is clearly demonstrated from Scripture and the sense of the early church, by Wall, Hey, Tomline, and other writers. That this was also the doctrine of our English reformers, is evident from the two following extracts from the book of Homilies:—"In churches, the fountain of regeneration is presented to us: the body and blood of Christ is offered:" here the two sacraments are spoken of, p. 229. "Christ changed frequent washings into the sacrament of regeneration," p. 243. All then who are regenerated, that is, all who are baptized, are held by the Homilies to be justified. Now, to be justified, according to the eleventh Article, is to be accounted righteous before God; all then who are baptized, are accounted righteous before God. Here therefore the Homily speaks a language directly opposite to the doctrine of election and reprobation. But further, as all who are baptized are not actually saved; to be regenerated and justified, is not to be certainly saved; to be once accounted righteous before God, is not to be certainly saved: here, then, is an opposition to the doctrine of final perseverance. Once more, it is the doctrine of

the Gospel and of our eleventh Article, that we are justified by faith only, and not for our own works and deservings. But that this faith is not irrespective to our own works and deservings, as is the doctrine of high Calvinism, appears from the Homily of the true and lively Faith, where we read that "Faith is taken in Scripture two ways; one faith, being dead, bringeth forth no good works; another worketh by charity, and is a quick and lively faith," Galat. v. 6. Eschewing evil and doing gladly all good works. Universal redemption is taught in the Homily concerning the Nativity; in that for Good Friday, and in that for the Sacrament. In the latter, the death of Christ is said to be available for the redemption of ALL the world.

That grace is not irresistible and overwhelming, that faith is in some measure an active effort, is seen from the following exhortation: "Yea, let us endeavour ourselves, good people, diligently to keep the presence of his Holy Spirit. Only let us apply ourselves to accept that grace that is offered to us*."

The eleventh Article, concerning justification by faith, gives a reference to the Homily of Justification. Now that Homily shows that the merit of works as an efficient cause was what the Article was intended to condemn; not but that the faith

* Homilies, p. 417, Oxford edit. 8vo.

required *must necessarily be supported by conversion and repentance*. Bishop Tomline, in short, in many parts of his Refutation, has proved the Homilies to be Anti-calvinistic. Now the Articles commend the Homilies as containing a doctrine wholesome, godly, and necessary. Ridley styles them sermons in praise of the virtues and against the vices. Let it be remembered, that the subjects of many of the Homilies are intimately connected with the Calvinistic system; such as, original sin, the salvation of mankind, faith, good works, declining from God, the nativity, the passion, the resurrection, the descent of the Holy Ghost, the grace of God, and repentance. Now, all these topics are successively treated of, yet not one point of Calvinism is mentioned.

VIII. The advocates for a Calvinistic interpretation of the formularies, unable to maintain their position either by arguments drawn from the sentiments of the composers, or from the documents themselves, have again shifted their ground, and made one more attempt at proof, by asserting that these documents were generally understood in a Calvinistic sense, in the times immediately succeeding their publication. It may not be improper then to examine the strength of this argument: presuming that, even were the affirmative established, it would not go the length of proving the formularies themselves to be Calvinistic; since the inundation of Genevan divinity, which took place

in the reign of Elizabeth, may have induced many to accommodate subscription to their predestinarian principles, by strained interpretations which the early reformers did not contemplate. In conducting this inquiry, we ought also to carry along with us the recollection, that the depreciation of moral works was often overcharged with strong colouring, in order to combat the grand Popish error of deeming obedience to be in itself meritorious and efficacious*.

After the short primacy of Grindall, the successor of Parker, and himself one of the composers of the Liturgy, the metropolitan chair was occupied by Dr. Whitgift. Under this prelate's

* Hooker finished his Ecclesiastical Polity, under the patronage of Whitgift, A. D. 1600. He has been pronounced a Calvinist by Overton, and again and again, by the Christian Observer. "Hooker, however," says Strype, "was for *universal redemption*; Travers for excluding the greatest part of mankind †," &c. Neither did Hooker believe the doctrine of assurance in a Calvinistic sense‡. Further, in his sermon on Justification, he says, "To say ye cannot be saved *by Christ without works*, is to add things, not only not excluded, but commanded; as being in their place and in their kind NECESSARY, and therefore subordinated unto Christ, by Christ himself." A Calvinist may pretend that this is his own doctrine; but we may doubt whether a Calvinist would state it in this manner. A true Calvinist objects to "conditional justification, as overturning the whole scheme of the Gospel §."

† Life of Whitgift, p. 235.

‡ See Walton's Account of his Controversy with Travers.

§ See Sir Richard Hill's Controversy with Daubeny.

sanction, were drawn up the Lambeth Articles, 1588, which exhibit a portraiture of high Calvinism. Whether they were published against Anti-calvinists or Antinomians, it is not material to determine. Their appearance evinces, that, in the opinion of Whitgift, the Thirty-nine Articles, revised for the last time in 1571, did not speak distinctly the language of Calvinism. It is highly to the honour of Elizabeth, that, as soon as the contents were known to her, these nine articles were disapproved of and discouraged.

I have adverted in the preceding volume to the unaccountable inconsistency of Whitgift, in promulgating Calvinistic doctrines, and countenancing Anti-calvinian ministers. Some facts, however, may now be produced, to show that he wavered in his predestinarian opinions. Cartwright had sown the seeds of Calvinism in Cambridge; and Whitaker, Margaret professor in 1580, promoted their growth. Yet Baro, his predecessor, had taught opposite doctrines; and Barrett, in 1595, censured Calvinism in an university sermon. This gave offence to the heads, who imagining the seventeenth Article to be in their favour, compelled the preacher to sign a feigned recantation. But Whitgift told the heads in a letter*, that they had made Barrett affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine held by many sound and learned divines

* Strype, p. 440.

in the church of England, and in other churches likewise, men of best account; and which, for his own part, he thought to be false, and contrary to the Scriptures. For the Scriptures were plain, that God, by his absolute will, did not hate and reject any man. There might be impiety in believing the one; there could be none in believing the other. Neither was it contrary to any article of religion, established by authority in the church of England, but rather agreeable thereto. He demanded what article of the church in particular, the doctrines of Barrett controverted. But Whitaker in his answer specifies no one: replying, that Barrett's opinions, *if not against the Articles*, were yet against the religion of the church, publicly received*; and always maintained in sermons, and in lectures. This plea, however, was not founded in truth; for the sermon of Harsnet at St. Paul's Cross, 1584, and of Hooker at the Temple, 1585, had condemned absolute reprobation: these divines being both patronized by Whitgift. And Dr. Baro had delivered Anti-calvinian lectures and sermons in Cambridge, for fourteen years before†. It is to be noted, that the heads, in their original charge, had urged the seventeenth Article as in their favour; but Whitaker, in his answer, drops this argument. Some time afterwards, Whitaker specified the eleventh Article, on justification by faith

* Strype's Appendix, p. 199.

† Heylin, *Quinquartic. Hist.* p. 624.

only, as one contravened by Barrett* ; but the Archbishop still expressed himself not satisfied. As to the Lambeth Articles, drawn up by Whitaker, to which this controversy gave rise, it is probable that Whitgift had been, before their promulgation, reasoned into a change of sentiment. We have already shown, in Vol. I. that they were signed only by five prelates, two of whom excepted against some of the phrases as too strong. We may add, that Dr. Baro wrote a soft construction of them ; and vindicated his sentiments as consonant to the AVOWED Articles, in conformity to the meaning of which, those of Lambeth, he conceived, ought to be interpreted †.

Under Usher, the Irish Confession was drawn up, in 1615, in which the Articles of Lambeth were interwoven. Usher, then, did not conceive the Thirty-nine Articles to be Calvinistic. In 1634, this latter rule of belief was adopted by the Irish church. Usher some time afterwards renounced

* Strype, p. 450.

† In the second Admonition, published 1572, the Calvinists affirm that “ for free will, not only they (the Bishops) are suspected, but others also ; and indeed the Book of Articles of Christian Religion speaketh very dangerously of falling from grace ; which is to be reformed, because it too much inclineth to their error ‡.” This complaint was repeated in 1587 §.

‡ Playfere, Appell. Evang. part iii. ch. 16.

§ Bridges's Defence of the Government established, &c. p. 1398.

his Calvinistic opinions; but it does not appear that he renounced the English Articles.

In the Hampton Court conference, 1603, the Calvinists petitioned for the enlargement of the Book of Articles, the insertion of those of Lambeth, and the addition, in the sixteenth, of “not totally or finally,” after the words, “depart from grace.” Again, at the synod of Dort, 1618, the English divines (although they were outvoted) were commissioned to assert the doctrine of universal redemption; and we know that one of them, Davenant, was in all respects an Arminian. Montague’s Arminian work, *Appello Cæsarem*, 1624, was ordered by King James to be licensed by Dr. White, “as agreeable to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline established in the church of England*.” During even the subsequent reign of violence, in which Arminianism was branded as Popery, it was by no means universally allowed, that the Articles speak the language of Calvinism. In 1626 appeared a proclamation, forbidding new opinions in the doctrine of the church; and in 1628, the

* It is true, that the courtiers accused him as contradicting the seventeenth Article. But how? By affirming that men justified *MAY* fall away, and *MAY* rise again, but not *certainly* or *necessarily*. But this is in fact the doctrine of the sixteenth Article, which says, not *MUST*, but *MAY* rise again. Here the error of the Calvinists consisted in supposing an identity between the terms justified and elect. They strained the seventeenth Article to suit the purpose of accusation; and shut their eyes to the sixteenth, the twenty-seventh, and the thirty-first.

Declaration prefixed to the Articles, confined all preachers to their *plain* and general meaning; and prohibited NEW senses, and the drawing of any Article aside. These edicts were interpreted by the Calvinists as restraining them from preaching the saving doctrines of God's free grace, in election and predestination. Was not this to confess these doctrines to be a new sense of the Articles? Was not this to admit, that the Articles could not support these doctrines, without being drawn aside from their plain and general meaning*? To say the least then, during the whole preceding period, absolute reprobation was generally condemned in the church; and universal redemption, with the possibility of departing finally from grace, were doctrines as generally admitted. Any of these opinions, pursued in their consequences, will destroy the whole frame of the quinquarticular system.

IX. These decisive proofs that the Articles are not Calvinistic, may be summed up by contrasting them with the confessions of churches avowedly Calvinistic. These last, we shall find, speak concerning the disputed points with a fulness, positiveness, and precision, which leaves no room for the shadow of a doubt respecting their scope and meaning. Is it not fair then to conclude, that, had the intention been to set forth our own

* See Collier, vol. ii. p. 747.

being accounted righteous before God ; the cause, the merits of Christ ; the means, faith ;" while a reference is made to the homily on that subject. Now, this homily states good works to be necessary. Here, then, nothing is said of two Calvinistic points ; of justification as a state of actual acceptance, in opposition to the Arminian belief, which considers it as a state of reconciliation, furnishing the groundwork of that acceptance ; and of works, required merely as a test of faith, or acknowledgment of gratitude for divine mercy, in opposition to the Arminian belief in their indispensableness, in following faith, as a condition of that unmerited mercy. On both these subjects, Calvinistic confessions will be found to speak plainly out. Not less cautious is the church in her forbearance to press Calvinistic doctrines in her *seventeenth* Article. Every other confession which mentions predestination, speaks of it as absolute and irrespective ; as a separation of some to life, that they might be faithful ; not from a prescience that they would embrace, by faith, the terms of salvation. In our *seventeenth* Article this question of absolute, irrespective election is wholly omitted ; and not one syllable occurs respecting preterition or reprobation. Here is no mention, as in other Calvinistic churches, of God's determinate counsel to save **SOME ONLY** ; while the saving clause in the end, referring to the will of God, as generally set forth in Scripture for a

guide to our doings, is peculiar to the English confession.

From the whole, it may be inferred, that the compilers of the Articles intended not to speak decidedly a Calvinistic, exclusive language, but rather to forbear pressing the points in dispute, in the hope of healing the differences attendant upon the Reformation. The Articles are not to be commented on, then, as implying a Calvinistic sense; for not only do they bear intrinsic evidence of an intention not to speak that sense; but when the Lambeth Articles, in the reign of Elizabeth, and the Puritan preachers in that of Charles the First, attempted to pronounce that sense as their only interpretation, the suppression of the former, and the declaration forbidding innovation directed against the latter, prove that the Articles are intended by the imposers, as they were by the compilers, to be understood in their plain and literal meaning.

We have been, in this place, only concerned to show, that the Articles admit clearly of Arminian interpretation, but not *clearly* of Calvinistic. How a Calvinist can subscribe the thirty-first, which, in admitting universal redemption, destroys the whole quinquarticular fabric, we leave it with his conscience to determine.

N O T E S.

ORIGINAL SIN.

Lambeth Article, fourth (applied to infants). "They who are not predestinated to salvation, shall be **NECESSARILY DAMNED** for their sins."

Synod of Dort. N. B. (abbreviated by Dan. Tilenus). This synod may be held as the representative of all the Calvinian churches of Europe, except those of France.

"That by Adam's fall, his posterity lost their free-will; being put to an unavoidable necessity to do, or not to do, whatsoever they do, or do not, whether it be good or bad, being predestinated thereunto by the eternal and effectual secret decree of God."

Ninth Article of the English Church, revised by the Assembly of Divines, at Westminster, in 1643. "Man is *very far* gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil;" altered into, "Wholly deprived of original righteousness, and is, of his own nature, inclined only to evil:" and again, "Concupiscence hath the nature of sin;" to, "Is truly and properly sin."

Irish Articles of 1615. "None can come to Christ unless it be given unto him; and all men are not so drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son; neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed to every man, whereby he is enabled to come to everlasting life."

Assembly's shorter Catechism, approved by the Scottish General Assembly. "The corruption of his **WHOLE** nature, which is commonly called original sin," &c. And whereas our ninth Article says, gently and timidly, of original sin, that it **DESERVETH** God's wrath and damnation, &c. this Catechism declares, that "All mankind, by their fall, lost communion with

God; are under his wrath and curse; and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell for ever."

JUSTIFICATION.

Lambeth Article, fifth. A justifying faith falleth not away, in the elect, either totally or finally.—*Sixth.* A man endued with justifying faith, is CERTAIN of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. See the whole.

Synod of Dort, fourth. "That God, to save his elect from the corrupt mass, doth beget faith in them, by a power equal to that whereby he created the world; insomuch that they to whom it is given, cannot reject it; and the rest, being reprobate, cannot accept it."

Eleventh Article of the English Church, altered by the Assembly of Divines, in 1643. "We are accounted righteous before God, &c." altered into, "We are justified, that is, accounted righteous before God, and have remission of sins, freely by his grace," &c.: and there is inserted the passage, "his whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed to us."

Irish Articles of 1615. "The Scripture useth to say, that faith without works, and the ancient fathers of the church to the same purpose, that faith only doth justify us. So that a true believer may be certain, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiveness of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. A true life, by justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away, in the regenerate, either finally, or totally."

Calvin's Common Prayer Book for Geneva. "The justice of Jesus Christ is imputed to such as, by true faith, cleave unto him."

Assembly's Catechism; or, Confessional of Scotland. "Q. What benefits do they that are EFFECTUALLY called, partake of in this life? A. Justification, adoption, &c.—Q. What is justifi-

fication? A. Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone.—Q. What benefits, in this life, accompany justification? A. Assurance of God's love, increase of grace, and perseverance therein, to the end."

PREDESTINATION.

Lambeth Articles. 1. God, from eternity, predestinated certain men to life; certain men he hath REPROBATED. 2. The moving cause of predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of good works, &c. but only the good will of God. 7. Saving grace is not given to all men, &c.; and, 9. It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved.

Synod of Dort. 1. That God, by an absolute decree, hath elected to salvation a very small number of men, without any regard to their faith or obedience whatsoever; and secluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind, and appointed them by the sure decree, to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity or impenitence.

Irish Articles of 1615. By the same eternal counsel God hath predestinated some unto life, and reprobated some unto death, of both which there is a certain number, &c.

The cause moving God to predestinate unto life, is not the foreseeing of faith, or perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing in the person predestinated, but only the good pleasure of God himself, &c. "But such as are not predestinated to salvation, shall finally be condemned for their sins."

Calvin's Common Prayer Book for the English Church at Geneva. "God, who, of the lost sons of Adam, hath ordained some as vessels of wrath to damnation; and hath chosen others as vessels of his mercy to be saved." Phoenix, vol. ii. p. 207.

Assembly's Catechism (Shorter, for Youth), set forth by the Westminster Divines, in the time of Charles the First. "Q. Did God leave ALL mankind to perish in the estate of sin and mi-

sery? A. God, having, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected **SOME** to eternal life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the state of sin and misery, and to bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer.—Q. Who is the Redeemer of God's elect? A. The Redeemer of God's elect, &c."

Compare these three titles with the whole of our Thirty-nine Articles, and particularly with the ninth, eleventh, and seventeenth, or with the analysis of them offered above, and see whether they hold a language having even the remotest affinity to such strong, unambiguous Calvinism.

CHAPTER XII.

THE COMMONWEALTH.

Contents.

- I. *The Engagement.*—II. *Commissioners to examine Candidates for the Ministry; Penal Statutes abolished.*—III. *Acts against Licentiousness.*—IV. *Conciliatory Measures of the Government towards the Presbyterians and ejected Clergy.*—V. *Restrictions on the Press and Pulpit.*—VI. *Barebones' Parliament: Cromwell Protector.*—VII. *Enlarged Toleration.*—VIII. *Independents favoured: Tryers of Candidates for Orders.*—IX. *Lay Commissioners.*—X. *Encouragement of Episcopalians.*—XI. *Amicable Associations among the different religious Parties: and Plan of Toleration.*—XII. *The Parliament seem friendly to Republicanism.*—XIII. *Death and Character of Cromwell.*—XIV. *Acts or Ordinances.*—XV. *Learned Divines.*—XVI. *Miscellaneous Matters: Roman Catholics: Baptists: Independents; their Confession: Presbyterians: Death of Love.*—XVII. *Levellers.*—XVIII. *Fifth Monarchy Men.*—XIX. *Millenarians.*—XX. *Joanna Southcott: Carpenter.*—XXI. *Antinomians: History and Refutation of Antinomianism: Crisp, Saltmarsh, Cudworth, and Kelly.*—XXII. *Huntingtonians.*—XXIII. *Muggletonians.*—XXIV. *Quakers.*—XXV. *Statement and Refutation of their Tenets.*—XXVI. *Quaker-Methodists.*

I. THE English constitution was now wholly dissolved. An apology for a House of Commons,

consisting of about eighty members, all Independents, voted the House of Lords to be useless, and the office of a King dangerous to the state. To secure obedience to this decree, a new oath, denominated the engagement, was prepared: by which the jurors bound themselves to be faithful to the government established, excluding Lords and Monarch. This instrument was designed chiefly as an ordeal for the Presbyterians, who, as a body, concurred with the Scots, and pronounced the existing powers usurpers.

II. But since it was expedient to conciliate as well as bind to the new government, the multifarious sects which had sprung up in this period of confusion; an act, passed at the request of Fairfax and Cromwell, removed the whole body of penal statutes connected with religion, and established on their downfall a general toleration, from which Papists and Episcopalians were alone excepted. Another ordinance appointed commissioners for each county, who should judge concerning the qualifications of such candidates for the ministry, as could not comply with the forms of ordination before established.

III. In several ordinances, professedly intended to check the prevailing licentiousness, it is curious to observe in how marked a manner the scandalous vices are singled out, in a canting age, for animadversion and punishment. While adul-

tery, incest, fornication, swearing, sabbath-breaking, and blasphemy, are all subjected to the severe vengeance of the law, no notice whatever is taken of dishonesty or deceit *. In the general dissoluteness and impiety which demanded this partial check, we may perceive the fatal consequence of the wildness of fanatical sects. Men of understanding, whose principles are not strongly confirmed, or whose moral behaviour is inclined to lukewarmness and laxity, finding no rational or persuasive religion to embrace, relapse insensibly into infidels and brutes †.

IV. Though strong measures were resorted to in enforcing the new formulary of allegiance; though Milton, being appointed to defend the kingless government ‡, rallied the dissatisfied

* Neale, vol. ii. p. 382.

† The people, weary of war, and anxious for tranquillity, in general submitted patiently to the engagement: but many of the Presbyterian clergy resigned their preferments, in conscientious attachment to the old Scottish covenant, and thus left vacancies to be supplied by dissenting ministers. This change, indeed, did not materially signify, for they were all Calvinists together. At Chester, the engagement was condemned to the lowest pit of hell. Baxter, who, with other Presbyterian ministers, inveighed against the engagement, and extolled the covenant, relates, that the former was accepted by all sectaries and cavaliers. Life, p. 64, 65. It is well known, however, that the cavaliers of Lancashire and Cheshire published a string of reasons for refusing it. These men were not paltry time-servers; and Mr. Baxter, who would exhibit them as such, was certainly *not well acquainted with this matter*.

‡ Whitlock, p. 387.

preachers with all the wit of his satirical pen; though recusants of the engagement, above eighteen years of age, were prohibited from suing in any court of law; and ministers assailing the government from the pulpit were sequestered from their benefices; yet while menace and infliction were thus held out in the one hand, concession and conciliation were tendered with the other. An Independent government directed that the national church should be Presbyterian in doctrine, discipline, and worship. The lands of bishops, deans, and chapters, which had been in sequestration since 1646, were sold; while to the sum obtained in return were added the first fruits and tenths of ecclesiastical preferments, formerly payable to the crown; and this consolidated fund was applied to the purpose of raising poor livings to the value of one hundred pounds a-year †. Part of these resources was, however, expended in salaries for the ex-bishops, and for other displaced cathedral ecclesiastics. Generous mutineers, who on turning adrift your officers, in an open boat, upon the stormy sea of life, flung them forth a few biscuits and a keg of water, that you might flatter yourselves with a notion of your own unbounded humanity!

V. These regulations, however, were found in-

† Stobel, p. 111.

sufficient to pacify either the Royalist or Presbyterian party, who continued to launch forth from the pulpit and the press, their invectives against those who had outwitted and overpowered them. These two engines of discontent were accordingly subjected to restrictions; the press being laid entirely under the inspection and control of Parliament; and the monthly fast being abolished, which indeed had ever been only a meeting for debate and uncharitable aspersion.

VI. 1651. The coronation of Charles II. in Scotland (though under restrictions, which, it is probable, he never intended to observe, but which his northern subjects were most justly punished for their infamous intolerance in imposing); the epistolary controversy betwixt Cromwell and the Scottish divines, the victory gained by this extraordinary character at Worcester, which he considered as his crowning mercy, and the consequent flight of the sovereign into France, are events which we must rest satisfied with thus briefly noticing*.

1653. Jealous of the power of Cromwell, the Rump Parliament had it in contemplation to dis-

* "I remember," says Bishop Burnet, p. 53, "there were six sermons preached to the King, in one fast-day, without intermission. He was not allowed to walk abroad on Sundays, and received a reproof after dancing or cards had been, *at any time*, allowed at court; all which (and no wonder!) did not a little contribute to beget in him an aversion to strictness in religion."

band some part of the army ; but no sooner did the General discover their intentions, than, after a short and fruitless negotiation for arrears, perhaps merely a cover for his projected measures, he repaired to the House at the head of a few officers and privates, and quietly dissolved that assembly. Then followed some days of humiliation, and seeking after God. In compliance with Cromwell's wish, the council of officers decreed, that 139 persons should exercise the sovereign power ; all, according to the true spirit of practical republicanism, to be nominated solely by himself. With this dexterous measure he was content for the present, as preparatory to the execution of his grand design ; and precisely as he had conjectured, that miserable handful of statesmen, called Barebones', or the Little Parliament, being the dregs of the wildest fanatics, and chiefly men of low birth and mean acquirements, became tired in a few months of functions which they were incompetent to discharge, and after having committed some vulgar extravagancies in legislation, resigned the government into the hands of Cromwell as Lord Protector. This violent assumption of authority had now, in truth, been rendered in some degree necessary ; the Royalists being too unpopular, the Presbyterians too intolerant, and the Independents too weak in numbers, to be intrusted with supreme power. The Westminster assembly, hav-

ing lingered out as a committee, died a natural death, in sympathy with the Long Parliament.

VII. 1653. In the instrument of government, prepared by the council of officers, it was appointed that no penalties should enforce religious belief; that a regular provision should speedily be made for the ministry; and, as before, that a general toleration should be exercised, popery, prelacy, and licentiousness being alone excepted. Presbyterianism was nominally made the established religion; and in every county monthly presbyteries were still held for the ordination of ministers, agreeably to the forms prescribed by the directory.

VIII. 1654. Whether Cromwell is to be deemed a hypocrite or an enthusiast, he deserves credit for consistence, and, we may add, sincerity of enlarged sentiment, in his treatment of the various religious parties. While he exhibited the singular phenomenon of a governor's making a different persuasion from his own, the established faith of the nation whom he governs, he disarmed the Presbyterians of whatever might prove noxious to other professions, in their intolerant and tyrannical spirit. "I am the only one," said he, "who has known to subdue that insolent sect which can suffer none but itself! Can we not remember," wrote he at Edinburgh to the Scottish clergy, "what we ourselves have suffered lately from intolerance; and shall we inflict, when in power,

the like severities on our brethren?" At another time, a deputation of the London divines complained, that the cavalier episcopal clergy debauched the minds of the faithful, and drew them away from their regular ministers. "Do they so?" said the Protector; "I will give orders concerning this: but, hold! in what manner do the cavaliers debauch your people?"—"By preaching," replied the divines. "Is that all?" said Cromwell; "then preach back again*."

Cromwell favoured the Independents, not as himself an Independent, but because in principle and practice they were the most tolerant among all persuasions. His chaplains were Independents, and he himself frequently joined in the enthusiastic fervours of the meanest privates in the army. Still further to promote toleration, and to check the Presbyterians, he mingled among the commissioners, Independent and Baptist ministers, with nine or ten laymen; and their combined numbers, being in all thirty-eight, ~~were~~ now distinguished by the appellation of Tryers. Of these, five were sufficient to approve of candidates for the ministry, but not less than nine might reject them†. The

* See Warburton's Remarks.

The Protector likewise contemplated the giving of full encouragement to the Jews; but the minds of his counsellors and statesmen were not sufficiently expanded to sanction this measure with their assent.

† Scobel, p. 366; Baxter's Life, p. 72. The names of these commissioners may be seen in Neale, vol. ii.

candidates who passed muster received a sealed instrument from the commissioners, investing them in the full possession of their benefices. The Tryers, however, left to their own discretion, being all Calvinists, and many of them extravagant fanatics, inquired only concerning the conversion and progress in grace, perceptibly experienced by the probationers for the ministry; or, at best, investigated their proficiency in the Genevan doctrines*.

* This body sate at Whitehall till after the death of Cromwell, in 1659. For the convenience of remote ordination, they had sub-committees in the several counties. They demanded letters testimonial, but imposed no oath of allegiance to Cromwell; and hence several of the episcopal clergy glided silently into preferment. Among others, Fuller the historian obtained a living, having only answered to their inquiries, that he made a conscience of his thoughts.

The powers granted to the Tryers have been, with justice, pronounced to have been higher archiepiscopal and supra-metropolitan. Under the old regime, a clerk, if aggrieved or rejected, had the redress of a *Quare impedit*; but here no appeal was allowed from the decision, comprised, without comment, in the words, *Not approved*. Much expense and trouble were incurred by the clergy, from long journeys, and the delay of their examinations. The questions were such as ignorance, impudence, and hypocrisy might answer; and a man's own account of his sensible experiences was taken for Gospel. Nye and Peters were the two chief Tryers. When a malignant minister came before them, it was their usual manœuvre, to pose him with dark and abstruse questions in theology, in order to set his claim quietly aside. Two specimens of their examinations have fortunately been transmitted to posterity;

Little learning being requisite to satisfy these interrogatories, the ministry was disgraced by an

and it would have baffled the understandings of the wisest among the children of men, to have kept pace with the intricate windings of these inquisitors. But Duncombe and Sadler, the ministers under the torture, were themselves sublime Calvinists, or at least found it convenient to appear so; and their answers, in point of incomprehensible nonsense, fell not at all short of the questions which called them forth. Behold one or two examples! To me it is only matter of surprise, how these sophs and respondents could contrive to preserve their gravity.

Q. Is faith mediate or immediate?

A. It is mediate in one sense, and immediate in another.

Q. Was God willing or unwilling that Adam should fall?

A. With submission to your opinion, I conceive, there was a willing unwillingness.

N. B.—These two answers will remind the reader of the student at Cambridge, who being interrogated, “Whether the sun moves round the earth, or the earth round the sun?” replied, in order to make quite sure of his point, “Sometimes the one, and sometimes the other.”

Q. Which is greater, original or actual sin?

A. Actual.

Q. Is murder a greater sin than original sin?

Q. (*By another.*)—Is the branch greater than the root?

(*Remark by a third*)—That’s a home question.

A. Actual sin is an aggravation of original sin, and, therefore, it is a greater sin.

N. B.—By this reasoning, resentment is an aggravation of murder, and, therefore, it is a greater sin.

Q. Is regeneration a substance or an accident?

A. I do not understand your meaning.

Q. *Nye.* It is plain; answer.

admixture of low mechanics and pedlars. It is certain, however, says that historian who is never

Q. Do you believe Christ when you know him? or, do you know him when you believe him?

A. I know whom I have believed.

Q. Is he YOUR Lord only?

A. His death is sufficient for all worlds, but not effectual for all.

Q. Why so?

A. Because God will have mercy on whom he will have mercy: yea, and *as Mr. Tombs saith* (who this apostle was, is not specified), whom he will he hardeneth.

Q. Doth God harden any heart?

A. Yes.

Q. How can God harden a heart, and not be the author of sin?

A. God hardeneth a heart by withdrawing his grace.

Q. How can God withdraw his grace, when he could hinder sin, and not be the author of sin?

Here Mr. Sadler, not finding it quite convenient to return a direct answer, flew off at a tangent, rose like his ærial namesake of after-times, beyond the ken of mortals, and hid his head in clouds.

"There is a threefold precept," replied he; "1st, There is a precept of trial, as was that communicated to Abraham. 2dly, There is a precept of obedience, accompanied with sufficient grace; and, lastly, There is a precept of conviction, as is that addressed to the wicked."—Now, the precept of conviction addressed to the wicked, it appeared, was a precept accompanied with no grace; that is, an injunction without the power of performance: and yet, rejoined this consummate logician—yet is not God the author of sin. Q. E. D.

If these Tryers were Calvinists, it was surely the very height of imprudence to probe the question in this manner to the quick.

at a loss for something that may pass for a reason, that not one of these mechanics and pedlars, *who conformed at the Restoration*, was then rejected on the score of insufficiency. So he would make the indulgence of government towards Conformists

Who ever yet encountered a disciple of Calvin, who could endure, without evasion, this pushing of his principles, by question upon question, to their unavoidable consequences?

I shall record one other quere, for the sake of the felicitous reply :—

Q. What think you of the church of Rome, Sir? Is sh a true church, as Bishop Hall thought?

A. She is no true church. I consider her as a virgin deflowered.

There is a good deal of naïveté in the anecdote related concerning Nye, which sums up the history of the malignant Mr. Sadler. Lord William Paget, his mother's candidate having been "NOT APPROVED," applied personally to Nye for a **GODLY** minister, who should receive institution to the still vacant living, which was that of Compton Hayway, in Dorsetshire. "What is the yearly value of this benefice?" asked the Tryer. —"Something between 60*l.* and 80*l.*" replied his Lordship. —"I am afraid, my Lord, I cannot help you to a **VERY** godly man for such a place *."

To return to Mr. Sadler the *aëronaut*. Let me ask that gentleman, what he would say concerning a sovereign, who should first deprive him of his balloon, and then command him to fly in the air?—who should offer him 1000*l.* for his *aërial* excursion, and threaten to hang him up if he failed to accomplish it? Would he not consider him a monster, capricious, unjust, unmerciful—deserving of being either execrated for his tyranny, or bound in fetters for his frenzy?

* Walker, p. 178.

at the Restoration, a proof of the SUFFICIENCY of his pedlars. Bad logic ! If this proves any thing at all, it proves that, as might be expected of pedlars, they would rather give up their principles than their places.

It appears not that the charges of bribery preferred against these commissioners, had any other foundation than malice ; but their partiality for Independents, Antinomians, Anabaptists, and fifth monarchy men, to the exclusion of Presbyterians, Arminians, and Episcopalians, was manifest.

IX. A body of lay commissioners were shortly afterwards appointed to sit in judgment on the sufficiency of the officiating clergy, both in regard to learning and morals ; a most humiliating authority for the ecclesiastical body, and ill-softened by the occasional calling in of ministers as assessors. The oath of one person was deemed adequate evidence to convict ; and the reading of the Liturgy, a just ground of deprivation. No one was permitted to teach a school in the parish from which he had suffered ejection. One fifth part of the value of each ejected minister's benefice was, however, allotted to the support of his family.

X. Cromwell, whose policy was to obtain for his yet unsettled government the support of all parties, by distributing encouragement to all parties, displayed much more liberality towards the depressed members of the English Church, than had

been extended by the Presbyterian parliament. He seemed indifferent what religions were professed, and how many creeds were in vogue, provided his own person and administration continued in safety: even the Papists were suspected more on political than religious grounds; while the Church of England ecclesiastics were opposed and silenced for their loyalty rather than for their attachment to episcopacy*. Prelacy and Popery, indeed, still appeared in conjunction in almost all public acts; but it is remarkable, that in no one of all the histories of these times, do we read any longer of Popery and Arminianism, as synonymous or kindred evils. Several Episcopalians, chiefly of the Puritan feather, such as Usher, Brownrigg, Pearson, and Hall, were connived at in the use of the Liturgy. The society called "The Corporation for the Sons of the Clergy," had its origin under the Protectorate; Hall, son of the late celebrated prelate, and himself afterwards bishop of Chester, preaching the first sermon at St. Paul's. The subject of this discourse was the budding of Aaron's rod; and the sentiments, alluding to a regular priesthood, and the mutual indulgence due between those who use a form, and those who pray extemporaneously, evince, by their freedom, the tolerant spirit of the government.

XI. In harmony with this indulgent spirit, an

* Kennett, *Comp. Hist.* p. 203; *Conf. Plea*, part iv. p. 410.

amicable association, on the ground of principles insisting on nothing save what could be assented to alike by Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Independents, was established by Usher and Baxter. It had branches in various counties, and would probably have been greatly serviceable in mitigating the unchristian temper generated by contending persuasions; but the Sion College divines disapproved of this amalgamation, still hankering after their grand object, the power of the keys. If conducted on the basis of mutual sincerity, such unions could not be too strenuously panegyricized or encouraged; in the case under consideration, both parties were then the outs, and, consequently, on equal terms; but let it be hinted, without illiberality, that whenever a proposal is made for a similar association between churchmen and dissenters—as the former have every thing to lose, and the latter have every thing to gain—it will be the wisdom of the churchmen to parley with their arms in their hands.

Cromwell found himself supported by the Independents, whom he patronized; the city of London, which he flattered and favoured, and the army, whom he paid and prayed with: while his adversaries were, the cavaliers, who hated and despised him as an ignoble usurper; the high churchmen and Papists, who regarded him alike as having trampled down the heritage of God; the Presbyterians, enraged to perceive themselves overreached

and rifled by their former associates; and the republicans, either philosophical, like Algernon Sidney, or religious, like the fifth monarchy men. Although these various bodies, it is true, were marshalled, rather than united and compacted against him, it required all his influence, artifice, and talents, to keep enemies, so active and formidable, in check. In pursuing his wise system of soothing while he intimidated, he proposed a plan for granting toleration to all parties who should concur in believing in fundamentals; and appointed a committee to settle what fundamentals were. Usher having declined to act, the lead was taken by Baxter, who proposed as the platform of indulgence, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments*. But, it being objected, that this plan would include Socinians and Papists, a new basis was agreed on, in which the Trinity, the atonement, justification by faith, the resurrection, and eternal rewards and punishments, were set forth as the articles of belief essential to salvation. Texts were subjoined to the statement of each doctrine, and to that on justification it was added, that, nevertheless, to continue in any known sin is damnable†.

* Life, p. 205.

† Neale, vol. ii. p. 443.—By this instrument, the bodies to be excluded from indulgence were, Deists, Socinians, Papists, Arians, Antinomians, and, Mr. Neale adds, Quakers; but I cannot find any article which a Quaker could refuse to sub-

Cromwell, in like manner, projected an union of the Protestant interest, to be carried forward on a grand scale, by deputies from every reformed nation and state in the world.

XII. 1656. Though Cromwell had taken measures for securing a subservient parliament, an hundred members, refusing an absolute recognition of his government, were violently excluded from their seats. The remainder formally renounced the family of Stuart, and confirmed those acts of the council which concerned religion.

1657. After Cromwell's refusal of the kingly crown, the Parliament invested him with ampler powers, as Protector, than had been conferred even by the instrument of government. In the humble petition and advice, which contained these powers, a similar toleration to that avowed by the council was held forth, casting out, as usual, the four knaves from the pack, popery, prelacy, blasphemy, and profaneness. Thus, however, were the Presbyterians, and other sectaries, rendered friendly to the Independent Protector's sway; the former

scribe. This petulant author is pleased to carp at the whole scheme, asserting, that it is not for man to state what fundamentals are, since it is one thing to say a doctrine is true, and another, that salvation cannot be obtained without it. This last affirmation, however, is neither expressed nor implied; and the plan, as a rule for toleration, was fully as liberal as could be expected from the spirit of the times.

by their religion being made the established form, and the latter by receiving unlimited indulgence.

In the succeeding session of parliament, an upper house having been formed, the Commons voted the return of the hundred contumacious members, who had been refused admittance in the foregoing year; and a majority being thus obtained by Cromwell's enemies, the authority of his upper house was disavowed. As the proceeding tended to shake the Protectorate by destroying the buttresses, Cromwell dissolved the Parliament in the highest indignation.

XIII. No other circumstance, immediately connected with religion, saving a few particulars to be elsewhere more properly mentioned, occurred previous to the death of Cromwell, who sunk a martyr to long anxiety and continual fears of assassination, on the 3d of September 1658. This extraordinary man was at first a Presbyterian, but in his fortieth year joined the then feeble and lurking Independents. Though propelled by ambition, it is probable that, in the outset, he dreamed not of his ultimate elevation; that his views were extended as new situations opened themselves; and that he would have at one time shrunk, like Hazael, from the bare idea of crimes, which he afterwards vindicated on the plea of expedience. Perhaps, too, as he advanced, he caught the frenzy of the times, and what was commenced in dissimulation terminated in enthusiasm. To have

surmounted so many obstacles as lay in his road to dominion; to have beheld, in such times of turbulence, the full success of his arms; to have maintained his high authority; to have monopolized the whole civil and military power; to have restrained or mitigated the fierceness of political and religious adversaries; to have disarmed the opposition, and in some measure conciliated the favour, of so many discordant and fanatical sects; and to have spread throughout all the world the terror of the English arms, and the glory of the English name,—must be admitted to evince a mind of uncommon vigour and ability. His chief talent was an expertness in discovering the characters of individuals, and a facility in accommodating himself to their ruling passion: he could be sententious with the moral, and mirthful with the social; he could alternately stoop to buffoonery, and rise to the wildest flights of enthusiasm. His moral character displayed virtue and vice in so singular a mixture, that it is difficult to determine whether the principle which he professed was sincerity or hypocrisy in religion. He was just, generous, temperate, chaste, brave, resolute; a patron of learned men; equitable to reward, as he was prompt to discern, talents for every situation and office in public life. As invested with sovereign and almost unlimited power, his chief ornament, however, was indulgence in religious opinions. His letters and sayings extant on this subject, dis-

play a wisdom and a temper for which he has obtained too scanty a praise.

His conduct was actuated by maxims hollow and pernicious: that private justice must give way to necessity; that an appeal to the sword is an appeal to God; that success is the criterion of the divine favour. He was much governed by the impressions he felt or fancied in prayer; if these were lively, regarding them as a rule of action; if languid, a denial. That he considered the 3d of September as his fortunate day, is not surprising, when we recollect that on that day he obtained his two victories of Dunbar and Worcester. His opening a parliament on a Sunday, because it happened to be that day, is to be condemned for its profaneness, if not for its superstition; but who is the hardy man who shall ridicule the predilection for a particular season or hour; who shall esteem every day alike, when he recollects, that on the 3d of September, the anniversary of his chief victories, the Protector breathed his last? He was interred in state at Westminster; but, at the Restoration, removed to Tyburn, where, after his coffin had been hung up till sunset, it was buried in a hole at the foot of the gallows.—Shade of an usurper! I am writing nearly over thy grave. I fear thee not; for I have delivered what I think to be the truth; and if I have, in these reflections, extenuated nothing, I have not set down aught in malice.

XIV. In 1654, an ordinance was passed for uniting small, and dividing large livings. By another an attempt was made, in 1656, to promote a stricter observance of the Sabbath. It is right and seemly to clean the outside of the platter: but let rulers beware, in doing so, of neglecting the more essential work, the internal purification of the governed. Some movements were made towards finding a provision for the clergy, in lieu of that eternal subject of contention, tithes; but the great difficulty, as usual, was, to obtain the acquiescence of the lay impropriators; and nothing was done in the end.

XV. Hall, Bishop of Norwich, died in 1656. He has left many works of deserved estimation, expository, polemical, devotional, and practical, which occupy places in the library of classical divinity. From his moralizing vein, and the purity of his style, he has obtained the name of the English Seneca *. When dispossessed, on the overthrow of episcopacy, he was allowed, in addition to his fifths, an annual pension of 40*l*. In 1657, was published Walton's Polyglot Bible. It presented the sacred text in nine ancient languages; and obtained for the learned author the bishopric of Chester. In depriving the Hebrew of points, it excited the animadversion of Dr. Owen, who

* Fuller's Worthies, b. ii. p. 180.

I once attended a journeyman printer in his last illness, who stated, that the printing of the works of Bishop Hall had given him his first serious impressions.

contended for the antiquity of the Hebrew points, and for the use of these interpreters in elucidating doubtful passages. Of the learned Usher we have already had frequent occasion to speak: his chief works are entitled, “*De Ecclesiarum Christianarum Successu et Statu*,” “*The Antiquities of the British Churches*,” and “*Annals of the Old and New Testament*.” He has also left a volume of sermons*. In the same year with Usher, 1654, died Selden, so learned an Hebraist and antiquary, as to have been styled by Grotius “the glory of the English nation.” In the assembly, when a text was quoted, he used to silence the divines by answering, “So it may be in your little pocket Bibles with gilded leaves; but the original is thus.” Menasses Ben Israel wrote under the Protectorate, in behalf of his countrymen the Jews; but the age was not arrived for liberality of sentiment or conduct towards that people, “trodden down of the Gentiles.” The miscellaneous divinity of the ever-memorable Hales was published a few years after his death, in 1656, under the title of *Golden Remains*. Hammond, the commentator, bade adieu to the world and its glories, a month previous to the restoration of Charles II. who had then marked out the vacant bishopric of Worcester as a reward for his unshaken loyalty. The immortal poem of Milton was written in the time, though not under the auspices, of Cromwell.

* See Parr's Life of Usher.

XVI. Different accounts are transmitted respecting the general state of religion, during the period of which we have now been treating; though perhaps they are not wholly irreconcilable; for while Kennett and Echard relate, that all heresy and blasphemy were promulgated, it is very guardedly affirmed by Baxter and Neale, that there was much *APPEARANCE* of sobriety*. The Papists, if we may believe Bishop Kennett, were numerous; but Neale maintains, that this could not very well be the case, since the spirit of dislike to them was kept up to the height, by calling the Pope antichrist from all the pulpits, by burning him in effigy, and by banishing his adherents twenty miles from the metropolis; "but such," he adds, "is the zeal of this right reverend historian." It is not clearly evident, how his *ZEAL* could be concerned in relating a simple fact; unless the nibbling adversary alludes to that species of zeal, which would have suppressed the fact if it had happened to be an unpleasant one. But the harsh persecutions, recorded with so much exultation (such is the zeal, such is the charity, of *THIS* historian), instead of disproving, substantiate Kennett's assertion, that the Papists were still numerous. Too many similar proofs, indeed, of this fact exist. We have seen, that from every grace of toleration extended by Cromwell, the

* Life of Baxter, p. 86.

Papists were the outcasts and the reprobate. We may add, that when the oath of abjuration, proposed in 1656, was refused, the Protector was entitled to seize two thirds of the recusant's estate, both real and personal.

Much pains have been taken to prove, that Charles II. when on the continent, became a convert to the Popish superstition. Now, it is admitted, that, in 1651, the French king forbade his using the Liturgy in the Louvre, and that strong interest was made for the recovery of that privilege *. Three years afterwards, Charles was closely beset by the Papists; but Lord Clarendon advised him to adhere to the Protestant cause; and as this monarch had little or no religion of any kind, it was not difficult to obtain a nominal compliance. But his having knelt before a crucifix, at the treaty of the Pyrenees, in 1659, is insisted on as the grand proof of his conversion to Popery. Now, although this fact be in itself doubtful, yet when we recollect, that Charles went to the Pyrenees to engage the Catholic powers for his restoration, we can see how his attending mass as a politician may be true enough, and, nevertheless, may prove nothing. His attachment to Protestantism is evident, from various letters written by Drelincourt, Gaches, D'Aille, and De L'Angle, French Protestant pastors, and from Morley, afterwards Bishop of Win-

* Neale, vol. ii. p. 413.

chester. It is an easy matter to allege, that these were written as blinds ; but thus may all concurrent testimony be decried by a sneer.

The ANABAPTISTS, defeated in the aims for which they had striven, addressed the King, as loyal subjects, in 1658, styling the Protector, whom they naturally abhorred, a landskip of iniquity, a sink of sin, and a compendium of baseness. It does not appear what notice was taken of these rhetorical flourishes.

A petition was presented to Cromwell by the leading INDEPENDENTS, in 1658, entreating permission to form an association of their churches, and to publish a confession of faith. He lived not to witness the execution of this proposal ; but soon after his decease, they assembled in the Savoy, October 12th, 1658, and published two hundred articles of faith and discipline, arranged in thirty-three chapters, which were prepared and agreed upon in the short space of eleven days. In that part which related to doctrine, this exposition was none other than the Assembly's Catechism with some slight alterations. Their rule of discipline lays down all the invariable principles of Independence*.

* Each congregation is a church, acknowledging no extrinsic authority. Election by the congregation is ordination ; and though it may be followed by imposition of hands, is valid without such form ; and imposition of hands, without election, conveys no official power. Conferences may be held by different churches for mutual advice ; but no decisions of such

At the Restoration fell ultimately the power of the Independents. With their management of civil matters I shall not now concern myself; but all the world will allow, that, in point of religious liberty, their conduct when in power (and would that the same could be averred of all other religious bodies!) fulfilled the promises made by their speculations when in obscurity. They exhibit a noble and memorable example of a sect, who, in possessing the citadel of establishment, forgot and forgave the injuries they had sustained; abused not authority by the oppression of their brethren in Christ, and were content to hold even the second place, preferring others before themselves in honour and emolument. I pass by their exceptions of popery and prelacy. I think of the spirit of the times. I look not to their edicts, but to their acts: and I would judge with Christian candour. Let not odium be heaped uncharitably on the memories of Owen and Nye, of Goodwin and Greenhill. There is no body of my dissenting brethren to whom I would more willingly and

meetings are authoritative. Less pure churches may be received to communion. Baxter, who is no longer the "knowing one" of Mr. Neale, finds fault with this assembly, for having said that men have no righteousness save that of Christ alone; although their plain meaning was a true and orthodox one, namely, that men have no righteousness, which can justify them, but that of Christ †.

† Life, p. 104.

cordially stretch forth the right hand of fellowship, than to the Congregationalists*.

The establishment of the Presbyterian discipline did little under the Protectorate towards gaining the hearts of the PRESBYTERIANS. Defeated in their views of obtaining supreme power, they leagued with their brethren the Scots, projecting the introduction of the Covenant, and of the King, provided he would support it. At the head of this party was the Rev. Mr. Love, whom the reader may recollect as preaching the very charitable sermon at Uxbridge. By a singular contrivance of Providence, this discourse proved his ruin; for, after he had been condemned on his trial, a reprieve was sent from Cromwell; but a body of cavaliers intercepting the messenger, declared, that the preacher of such firebrand doctrines was altogether unworthy of compassion, and angrily tore the instrument in pieces. In the mean time the prisoner suffered, and by his death terror was struck into the hearts of the Presbyterian body.

XVII. Religion, at all times mixing its influence in human affairs, was now the main spring of all determination and action. Had this principle been directed by truth and soberness, it would

* I am acquainted, in a most polite and obliging communication, by Dr. Pye Smith, of Homerton, that they "prefer this title, as less liable to exception, and more expressive of their characteristic sentiments," than the word which I have chiefly employed, but which it is now too late to alter.

have introduced a golden age of Christianity; but as it was usually perverted by a distempered imagination, the age was distinguished by anarchy, cant, and fanaticism. Ignorance, pretending to inspiration, assumed the province of instructing; and that monster, lay-preaching, was engendered. Within and without the pale of the establishment, a system of religious teaching prevailed, which, being founded neither in tradition nor in reason, but solely on the wild notion of immediate and personal revelation, was supported by a jargon of vulgar rhetoric. All persons might exhibit their gifts wherever they pleased; every man delivered what was right in his own eyes, and “it was then a most signal mark of a saint,” says Nicholls, “to be the author of some monstrous opinions.” It is difficult to determine, whether some of these declaimers ought to be characterized as political madmen, or as sectaries in religion. Of this doubtful species were THE LEVELLERS, who insisted, that power and property should be equally distributed, agreeably to the alleged practice of the early Christian church, whose members are described as having all things in common (Acts, ii. 44; and iv. 32); although such expressions imply such a communication of superfluities as should prevent any disciple from having need; which is evident from numerous exhortations to almsgiving, which suppose inequality of possessions, and to industry, which would be neglected

by the profligate, were property made a common stock *. Acts, v. 4 ; Rom. xiii. 7 ; 2 Thess. iii. 12, &c. Peter would have possessed something, had the rich given all ; but he told the lame man, that he had neither silver nor gold.

XVIII. The *fifth monarchy men* taught, that it is the duty of all persons to look for the second appearance of Christ, and, therefore, that all human government should be abolished †. This absurd conclusion deserves no ampler notice than a reference of any who may accord with it to the words, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake ; whether to the king as supreme, or to rulers as to them that bear authority under him" (1 Peter, ii. 13).

XIX. A similar inference was derived from a different body of opinions, by many of the MIL-

* See first vol. p. 32.

† They regarded themselves as the saints, who were to reign as deputies of Christ on earth (Dan. vii. 27) ; and some among them exchanged their names for those of Scripture. The four great monarchies, alluded to by Daniel, were to merge in that of the Messiah, and hence the title of the sect.

In 1658, the fifth monarchy men plotted in London, to assassinate Cromwell, and to proclaim King Jesus. Venner led fifty of them forth from his meeting-house in Coleman Street. Their banner was a lion couchant, to express "the lion of the tribe of Judah," having as a motto, the words, "Who will rouse him up?" This wretched maniple of a church militant was, in a few days, easily checked ; though not until the London trained bands, a body of redoubted heroes, had convinced the world, by sustaining a defeat, that *they* would be for ever guiltless of establishing a fifth monarchy.

LENARIANS, a kindred sect to the fifth monarchy men, but more respectable and permanent. It is believed by this body of Christians, that, after the first resurrection, the saints will reign on earth with Christ for a thousand years ; an opinion which they deduce from some passages in the Apocalypse and other Scriptural books ; no one of which, however, speaks so positively on the subject, as not to leave room for a different interpretation. This doctrine is conceived to have prevailed before the coming of our Lord, being attributed to a tradition of Elijah, which, arguing from the day of rest succeeding the six days' work of creation, affirms, that the world will continue a theatre of evil until six thousand years are fulfilled, after which will follow a Sabbath of a thousand years, consecrated to peace and righteousness, when the earth shall flourish in primeval verdure, and the saints of God shall walk in a renovated Eden. This is a beautiful vision, on which the mind delights to expatiate ; and as the hope is, at least, a harmless illusion, we cannot wonder at its having been sanctioned by Barnabas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and other fathers, as well as by the respectable modern names of Mede, Gill, Bishop Newton, Winchester, Kett, Bicheno, and, it is likewise thought, Porteus and Hannah More. On the other hand, Whitby, Lowman, Priestley, and the author of the Illustrations of Prophecy, contend against a literal interpretation of the passage in Revelations,

xx. 4, 5, 6, They regard the Jewish analogy of seven thousand years as a groundless Rabbinical fancy; and look forward, generally, to the universal diffusion of the Gospel. The present race of Jews acknowledge themselves to be Millenarians*. When the forty-two Articles were composed, in 1553, the 41st opposed the millenary doctrine; against which the 4th of the thirty-nine seems to militate; by affirming, that Christ sitteth in heaven, until he shall return to judge all men at the last day. According to the millenary doctrine taught in the fourth century, the scene of Christ's terrestrial reign is Judea; the just are to partake of the first resurrection, and those who shall be found alive at the commencement of this happier epoch, are to obtain a miraculous prolongation of their lives for one thousand years. The modern Millenarians, without entering minutely into an inquiry relative to the particulars of a scene wrapt in the womb of futurity, expect in the millennium an era of intelligence and prosperity, of tranquillity and universal harmony; some conceiving this to be, metaphorically, the first resurrection; and others looking for two resurrections, those of the saints, and the rest of mankind, at the distance of a thousand years from each other. Since the millenary opinions form an innoxious promise of hope, and pleasure of imagina-

* See Levi's Cerem. of the Jews, p. 206; and Grey's Disc. on Rev. xx.

tion, and since many pious individuals within the pale of the church take delight in dwelling on these speculative views, it seems unnecessary that we should waste much time upon the argument. We may be permitted to observe, however, that the passage in Revelations, "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years; but the rest of the dead lived not, until the thousand years were finished: this is the first resurrection," should be interpreted by the help of its context. Now we are assured, in the verse immediately succeeding, that after the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed from his prison, and shall go forth to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth; a power which certainly seems incompatible with the cloudless perfections of those new heavens and that new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Let Christians also be reminded of the presumption of fixing a precise date to the second advent of our Lord; which, they are explicitly told, will happen as a thief in the night. After all, though the millenary opinions were never professed by the whole church, or grafted in the established creed of any nation, the extinction of the old 41st Article against them, affords a latitude for speculation on the subject; and, in this view, we should be unwilling to rob the devout of a consolatory hope, or to retrench from religion her allurements of poetry and feeling.

“ Let there be light !” O that th’ Eternal voice
Would say, that we might see it, and rejoice !
Speed the blest hour, ye lingering wheels of time,
When Truth shall smile o’er every land and clime ;
When o’er the world shall spread Messiah’s reign,
As billows hide the channels of the main.
It comes ! Destruction is an art no more ;
Fair Friendship’s wreaths are twin’d from shore to shore !
Lo ! the tam’d wolf, abandoning his wild,
Dandles the kid, or wantons with the child ;
While, bound in brotherhood’s delightful cords,
Warriors to ploughshares beat their blood-stain’d swords !
E’en now th’ eternal spring begins to bloom ;
Faith to complete its triumph o’er the tomb ;
See, life’s new saplings, graceful, lift their heads ;
See filtering Pisons wear their oozy beds !
Hail, golden epoch ! joy, and truth, and peace,
—Of countless years ! of infinite increase !
Descend, bright vision ! leave your courts above,
Primeval blessedness, unbounded love !”

GRANT’S PASTORAL CARE.

And who can tell, but that the present gradual diffusion of civilization and religious knowledge, occasioned by the valuable labours of various active and zealous societies for propagating Christianity throughout the world, may be ushering in the morning of a day so bright and glorious ? On the shores of Africa, on the plains of Hindostan, in the unfrequented islands of the Pacific Ocean, and up to the confines of the Arctic Circle, fields appear already white unto the harvest. The whole of civilized America is peopled by professors of Christianity ; the religion of Christian countries is necessarily

disseminated wherever their merchandise is conveyed ; and all, in short, conspires to encourage the sanguine hope, that the halcyon period, the Sabbath of the universe, the desire of nations, the restitution of all things, approaches *.

XX. But whatever judgment may be passed on the sober and respectable advocates for the doctrine of an approaching millennium, we shall not hesitate to condemn several individuals and classes, of a widely opposite description, who, in promulgating or explaining the millenary doctrine, have mingled with it the delusions of a disturbed imagination, or converted it to the purposes of imposture.

To say nothing of the false prophets and maniacs of other countries, individuals of this stamp have, at different times, supported, or availed themselves of our national character, for propensity to staring at the marvellous. In the thirteenth century an Eng-

* Bishop Newton thinks, that the three periods mentioned in Daniel, of 1260, 1290, and 1335 years, allude severally to the restoration of the Jews, the destruction of the Ottoman empire, and the downfall of Antichrist, or the papal power : " Then shall the kingdoms of the world become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Revel. xi. 15.

See Adam's Relig. World, vol. iii.; Mosheim, cent. 3, p. 2, § 12; Newton on Proph. vol. i. p. 77; Whitby's Dissertation; Lowman on the Revel.; Illustrations of Prophecy; Hopkins; Bellamy; Taylor on the Millennium; Lardner's Credibility; Bicheno's Restoration of the Jews; Eyre's Observations on Prophecies.

lish virgin appeared in Italy, asserting that the Holy Ghost was incarnate in her, for the redemption of women, and baptizing persons of her own sex, agreeably to her doctrine, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of herself. For this daring impiety she was soon led to the stake. Other prophets and diviners in the year 1588, declared, that they had heard the stone walls foretell the impending destruction of the world *.

In 1783, a sect arose in Scotland, entitled BUCHANITES, from their leader, Mrs. Buchan, who told her followers, that she was the woman mentioned in the Revelations; and that all who believed in her mission, should, together with herself, be taken up into heaven without tasting of death. A number of them actually set out for the Holy Land, and had made considerable progress on the continent; when Mrs. Buchan herself happening to meet the end of all men, the hive dispersed themselves on the loss of the queen bee. Some years afterwards, 1793, the people of England

* The prophecy was done into verse in the following poetical octave:

“ When after Christ's birth there be expir'd,
Of hundreds fifteen, years eighty-eight;
Then comes the time of dangers to be fear'd,
And all mankind with dolours it shall fright.
For if the world in that year do not fall,
If sea and land then perish nor decay,
Yet empires all, and kingdoms after, shall,
And man to ease himself shall have no way.”

were called to attend to the prophecies of the mad-man BROTHERS ; who boasted among his followers a member of Parliament, Brassey Halhed, of considerable eminence as an oriental scholar. Brothers styled himself the nephew of Jesus Christ, and predicted, that, before the year 1798, the Jews should be all restored to their own land. " This prophet also perished (or came to a strait-waistcoat), and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed." Acts, v. 37. These examples, it might be imagined, would serve as a warning to the deluded followers of a blasphemer who is exciting some noise in the present day ; I allude to Joanna Southcott. I was at first in doubt whether it would be advisable to introduce any mention of this wretched body of fanatics in the present work : but since they have established regular houses of worship in London and Highgate, in Twickenham, Greenwich, Bradford, and other places ; since the delusion has spread abroad amongst the middle and lower classes to a considerable, nay, to an incredible extent, and especially since a daring prediction of a pretended Messiah, to be born of this woman, about the latter end of the present year (1814), has received a species of countenance which could hardly have been believed without the support of undoubted testimony, the Southcottians, or sealed people, appear to have an

unquestionable claim to be numbered among the English sects.

Gitcham, a small town in Devonshire, had the honour of giving birth to this woman, seen AFAR OFF by St. John at Patmos. She first beheld her future stomacher in the heavens in April, in the year 1750; being the daughter of a substantial farmer, who little dreamed that that luminary which ripened his corn and reddened his apples, should one day form so dazzling an article in his family wardrobe. In one of Joanna's publications, entitled, "What Manner of Communications are these?" (and well might she say that!!!) an account is given of her juvenile amour with Noah Bishop, who was ONE of her chief admirers. But poor Noah was not to be permitted to people a new world, as the antitype of his celebrated namesake; for, with a whimsical eccentricity, which pointed out her high destiny, his inamorata, though confessing a desperate attachment, invariably rejected his offers. A comparison of her early days, when "the fear of the Lord was deeply impressed on her mind and heart, and when she took delight in the reading of the Gospels," with the religious frenzy manifested in her later years, fills her biographer, Mr. Hann, to borrow his own fluent period, "with surprise, with pity, with indignation, and with horror." Joanna, like Mahomet, had entered her fortieth year, when she opened her divine commission, declaring herself

to be visited with the spirit of prophecy, and promising, in proof of it, the near approach of the millennium. Several circumstances which had recently happened in her own family, had at first only inspired the salutary conviction, that Heaven may speak by dreams, and that angels minister unto men; “but now,” says she *, “it is explained to me, that those things (namely, the death of her cousin at sea, after his sorrowful departure; accompanied by a dream of her mother’s, that she should see him no more) were designed as a solemn warning to the NATIONS, that the end of all things is at hand.”—This, Mr. R. Hann, disdaining the quip modest, says, he is not afraid to call “a most infernal lie †;” and if any spirit so explained it, he hesitates not to say that that spirit was the devil. To the same origin he traces all the dreams and visions, to which the preachers and sealed people of this prophetess pretend, in proof of her visitation’s being of God ‡.

When thus, in 1792 §, this upholsterer’s work-woman gave herself out, at Exeter, as “the Bride, the Lamb’s wife, and the woman clothed with the sun” (by this time we may remark,

* *Strange Effects of Faith*, p. 195.

† *Life*, p. 3.

‡ Hann was formerly a believer, or, according to Joanna, “He began in the Spirit and ended in the flesh.” He has a sister still in the impostor’s persuasion.

§ At this time the prophetess pretends having heard a voice crying, “Joanna, Joanna, the angels rejoiced at thy birth!”

all her EARTHLY lovers had dropped away), her friends, being plain, sensible people, were of opinion, that she was manifestly going out of her mind. As she was impatient, however, to obtain a respectable sanction to her mission, she addressed letters to the several dignitaries of Exeter cathedral; but these seemed, by treating her with a silent contempt, to have subscribed, without hesitation, to the conclusion drawn by her relatives. One clergyman, indeed, the Rev. Mr. Pomeroy, made a show of yielding assent, with a view of reclaiming her from her follies: but neither could HE be prevailed on to receive her seal, or to sanction her mission with his own *. In vain, too, the Methodists, who had at first regarded her as a prodigy, assured her, that her pretended spirit was a diabolical inmate. Before fifty-eight persons, their preachers being of the number, she publicly proclaimed her confidence in her divine mission. After undergoing several adventures,

* Mr. Pomeroy, who, as Joanna pretends, was six years a believer in her mission, consigned a portion of her writings and sealed papers to the flames. For so heinous an offence, she hurled forth against this reverend gentleman, the titles of the Arch-apostate, the Jehoiachim who burnt Jeremiah's roll, Judas Iscariot, a second Lucifer son of the morning, &c. &c. &c.; threatening him with law in this world, and perdition in the next,—unless he should work a miracle by restoring her identical writings. See Lane's *J. Southcott Detected*, p. 33.

Mr. Pomeroy died suddenly, on entering his reading-desk, and his decease was impudently pronounced to be a judgment.

from 1792 to 1801, she published five parts, or numbers, of her work, entitled "The strange Effects of Faith;" and passing strange they were!

This book appears to have made several proselytes; in particular, Dr. A—, the minister of C—k—e, in Somersetshire, and the Rev. Mr. F—y, brother of an English nobleman. Five gentlemen, having arrived in Exeter from different parts of the kingdom, at Christmas in the same year, in order to investigate the matter, remained there during seven days; at the end of which, three of them, it is affirmed, being clergymen, returned satisfied that Joanna's visitation was of God. All this, if true, proves but the wisdom of that French aphorism, "there never was so great a fool, as not to have found a greater fool to admire him."

On the 12th of January 1803, in consequence of a printed advertisement, a large meeting was held at Lord F.'s house, in Dudley Grove, Paddington, entitled Joanna's second trial. Only her friends were present; and of these, twenty-four were selected, twelve to act as judges, and twelve as jury. This court of inquiry sate, like the former, seven days; perhaps a day for every thousand years contained in the age of the world and the millennium; and the result was a second confirmation of Joanna's mission. On this occasion many manuscripts of the prophetess were unsealed: but, on the second day of May in the fol-

lowing year, Joanna received an order that they should be once more sealed up, until they should be demanded by the great, and learned, and powerful; which she foretold would happen in the course of twelve months. The demand, however, has unhappily not since been made by any of the parties specified in the prediction.

Another meeting was convened in December 1804*; and, as all the arguments were on one side, like the handle of a saucepan, "*Joanna's third trial*" placed her veracity beyond a doubt—that is, in the minds of all who had no doubts before.

Joanna has found a faithful adherent in the once opulent Miss Townly, who (to borrow the expression of a believer) has given up her mind and fortune to the work. Joanna, however, still conscious and jealous of pre-eminence, treats this companion as a mere understrapper; witness the following passage, extracted from one of her epistles, to be found in the book, entitled, "*What Manner of Communications are these?*"

"DEAR MISS TOWNLY†, July 10th, 1810.

"WHAT new wonders are daily presented before my views! I dare not suffer myself to in-

* See FOLEY'S Letter to the Vice-chancellors of Oxon and Cambridge, p. 15. Rowland Hill called these men three-and-twenty mad fools. See Copies of Letters sent to Exeter Clergy.

† This Jane Townly, and another handmaid, Ann Under-

dulge a thought of them ; if I did, I could not write or keep my senses ; but if we go one step from the directions the Lord hath given me, we are lost in time, and to all eternity."

Joanna Southcott, in her capacity as a prophetess, has visited several places in England, such as Leeds, Bristol, Stockport, Bradford, Stourbridge, Birmingham, &c. &c.; and she has every where met with religious infatuation sufficient to render her journeys a profitable concern.

At Leeds she found an able advocate in a visionary by the name of Turner, who had secret revelations of his own. Here, too, she was joined by the celebrated Mary Bateman, who had successively been a disciple of Swedenburg and Brothers, but afterwards found a lucrative trade in disposing, by retail, of the books and seals of our

wood, formerly Townly's waiting-maid, have lived together with the prophetess during the ten last years, and are with her at the present time. Joanna, playing at TRICKtrac, dictates her communications to Underwood, who takes them down from her mouth ; after which Townly signs her name as witness ; and thus, after a "double double toil and trouble," performed by these three witches at their caldron, the spell is considered as complete.

This trio claimed a spiritual *cousinship* with one Mr. Cosins, whom they very speedily contrived to COZEN out of a handsome fortune. Mr. Cosins died some time ago in a fright, and left to the firm a sum of several thousand pounds. The prophetess herself professes having bequeathed to her two faithful coadjutors the greater part of her property. See Fifth Book of Wonders.

spiritual mother. It is well known, that this underling practised her pretended sorceries on Mrs. Perigo, of Bramley, near Leeds, whom she murdered, after extorting from her upwards of seventy pounds. This wretch, who constantly wore the seal of Joanna near her heart, was executed at York, in March 1809, and her body lies to this day on the roof of the Leeds Infirmary. To the clergyman who visited her in the condemned cell, she intimated that his attendance was unnecessary, as she was a woman approved of by the Most High—an awful example of guilt and delusion, which the followers of the prophetess will do well to lay to heart*.

The sealed people abound in various parts of the country. In Bradford, alone, they amount to 600 or 700: in Birmingham to 500. Their numbers are also great at Old Swinford, and at Liphook in Hampshire, but chiefly in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire. In London, their principal chapel is in Duke's Place, near the Obelisk, where service is performed by the REVEREND Mr. Tozer, a ci-devant lath-splitter, and now expounder of the Revelations. Professing themselves members of the Church of England, they read the Liturgy, and administer the sacrament once a

* Another of the sealed people destroyed himself last Sunday, at Leeds,—after a sermon by a Southcottian preacher. Sept. 1, 1814.

month*. Their hymns are selected from the compositions of their prophetess; but that, if she is inspired, it is at least not from any spring in Parnassus, will probably be clear to all who shall peruse the following verses:

“The blood of all that you have slain,
They all were murder’d by such men;
Who now appear, these things to mock,
And now on them I’ll bring the stroke;
As down the kettle then did fall †,
You shall perceive I’ll bring on all.”

Having established her churches, and being weary of her wanderings, the prophetess has now fixed her residence in the metropolis, where she has lived for some years in a secret chamber, seen by few, and, latterly, spoken to by none. Here, however, according to her own account, she has been favoured with that extraordinary vision, of which it may be proper to record the particulars. “On the 14th of October 1813,” such is the statement in her Third Book of Wonders, “I was ordered to sit up all night in my room by myself, which I did. Many extraordinary things were revealed to me, and I was ordered to hold that night in everlasting remembrance. About twelve o’clock I looked at the candle; there ap-

* Three hundred persons recently received the sacrament at the hands of the Gibeonite, Tozer.

† Alluding to her kettle falling from the fire, while Joanna was sitting on the tripod.

peared something like a large bowl behind it, with a point towards the candle. The candle was flaming very bright, and there appeared a ring as red as scarlet, circled round the middle of the flame; immediately there appeared a hand as white as snow, which came out between the bowl and the candle, and, after having gashed my breast, pointed towards me. I trembled to see it, and was answered, 'Fear not, it is I.' I was then ordered to put on my glasses, and the hand appeared the second time, more brilliant than before; but then the flame of the candle seemed parted in two, and looked in a different manner from the first, but burnt very bright. The hand was pointed towards me the second time, as white as snow, and a red cuff was upon the wrist *."

In this manner it was revealed to her that she should shortly have a miraculous conception, similar to that of the blessed Virgin; and that before the end of the harvest 1814 she should bring forth the Shiloh, who shall lead the Israelites into the promised land, and establish the millennium upon earth. That this deluded woman should believe her own lie, it is not inconsistent with the experience of past ages to suppose; but that it should obtain implicit credit among a large

* Third Book of Wonders.—As this idea is plagiarized from the hand-writing in Belshazzar's vision, it is termed, very properly, "a SECOND-HAND prophecy." P. 57.

body of people, in different parts of the country, can only be accounted for by recollecting, that there are various shades of mental derangement, and that this unhappy malady is often discovered on one subject, by persons who discourse and act rationally upon every other. So strong, however, is the credence in the approaching fulfilment of the prediction, that the Southcottians have actually prepared a magnificent cradle, with splendid decorations and appendages of every kind to correspond, for the reception of the celestial guest. This singular curiosity has been seen by many persons during several days of the last month, July 1814, at Seddons's the cabinet-maker, in Aldersgate Street*.

* Under the impression that so lamentable a specimen of English credulity would hardly obtain credit in after-times, if supported only by vague reports in the newspapers, I was resolved to obtain as satisfactory evidence for the existence of the costly furniture, as should preclude the possibility of a doubt. On Saturday, July 30, the cradle was removed to the house of Mr. Hows, 10, Pollard's Lane, near Bethnal Green. Disappointed at Seddons's, where I had called a day or two afterwards, I went on Friday, Aug. 5, to this same pork-butcher's in Pollard's Lane, which I found with some difficulty. Unfortunately, the object of my search had been packed up a few hours before my arrival; but the housekeeper, after some hesitation, indulged me with a view of the case. Returning to Seddons's, I obtained a more minute account of this monument of gross fatuity, than had appeared in the public journals. The following then may be relied on as a correct description. It is a crib of satin-wood, three feet six

At this time, Mr. Tozer was contributing to

inches by two feet, with brass trellis side and foot-board: the feet are elegantly turned, carved, and gilt; and run upon casters. Inside is a swing cot caned, which swings on the centre. At each end there are gold mouldings. The cornice and canopy are of white and gold; and the latter is surmounted by a globe of gold, with a golden dove carrying in its mouth an olive-branch. The curtains are of blue damask, with gold fringe, and white muslin curtains underneath; the external curtains are looped up with rich golden tassels. On the head-cloth a crown and star are brilliantly embroidered; and above it appears in Hebrew characters, the word "Shiloh." Along the cornice are inscribed, likewise in letters of gold, the English words—(would that, for the sake of England, these also had been unintelligible to the multitude!) "A free-will offering of faith to the promised seed."

This royal manger is equipped with a lamb's wool mattress, a white fustian down bed, down pillow, and two superfine blankets. There are also damask napkins, sheeting of the finest linen, and golden pap-spoons.

Although, having now conversed with six persons who had seen the cradle, I could entertain no doubt as to its existence, I addressed as polite and delicate a note as I could pen, to Mr. Hows, stating the motive of my curiosity, and offering, if he would yet condescend to gratify it, to be answerable for the expense attending the opening of the case. But this president of the committee has not deigned to oblige me with a reply.

It has been stated, that the cradle is the sole gift of a lady of fortune. I believe, however, on good authority, that the expenses are to be defrayed by subscription. Such contributions are levied out of the pittances of the lower classes; many of whom deprive themselves of necessities to support the delusion. Surely, if the magistracy have power to send astrologers, fortune-tellers, and swindlers, to the house of correction, so flagrant an evil as this ought not to be suffered to escape.

the success of the delusion, by declaring from his

In addition to the equipments of the cradle, a font of pure gold has been ordered; and a pair of white satin shoes, having the words King of Salem, Priest of God, richly embroidered in silver on the satin, were made a month ago by Taylor in Bond Street. To ascertain this, I went this day, Aug. 12, 1814, to Taylor, the well-known "*Ambassador of Morocco*;" who acknowledged the truth of it, in the hearing of the Rev. Edward Williams, Curate of St. George's, Hanover Square.

But the silver cup and salver, presented by the maniacs of Birmingham, is still more blasphemous than any thing which has yet been noticed. The cup contains a quart; and on the salver is engraved, "Hail, Messiah! Prince of Salem." On the lid of the cup is a dove, with an olive-branch: the inscription round the rim, "Of the increase of his government, and peace, there shall be no end;" and on a shield on the body, "This present was sent as a token of love to the Prince of Peace, from a part of the believers in the divine mission of Joanna Southcott, at Birmingham." Encircled with vine-branches, appears the figure of a child destroying a serpent, having the motto, "It shall bruise thy head, then it is finished:" on the other side, a shield, with the inscription, "And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me." In another division are three angels, saying prayers, surrounded by rays, with the words, "Glory to God! Hallelujah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." A pair of goblets accompany the cup; on one of which is inscribed,

"Their palaces shall rise, the joyful Son
Shall finish what his short-liv'd Sire begun."

On the other,

"Their vines a shadow to their race shall yield,
And the same hand that sowed, shall reap, the field."

The engravings and inscriptions are said to do honour to the young artist who has dared to sit at work on such a gross im-

pulpit in Duke's Place, that "our spiritual mo-

piety. He is a Mr. Lowe, of Union Street, Birmingham. Presents, to the amount of several thousand pounds, have recently been sent to Joanna.

On the 11th of last June was published the Fifth Book of Wonders; which, after repeating the prophecy formerly delivered, respecting the miraculous birth, affirms that the future realization of the fact is now satisfactorily proved on the testimony of three mothers, and two medical gentlemen who have examined THEM as to the symptoms apparent in Joanna from the 17th of March to the 26th of May: the decided opinion of the whole being thereon, that if such symptoms were apparent in a young woman, she would be pregnant of a living child. Joanna herself declares, that in May she felt the life, and that she has felt life increasing more and more from the 16th May, to the 11th of June; so that a few months must decide whether she is an impostor or not, since she could not sustain the same gradual increase until the end of the year, without deliverance. She has likewise sent copies of her prophecy and portrait to the Prince Regent, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of London and Salisbury; to the Dukes of Gloucester and Kent, Earl Grosvenor, and the Recorder of London. All these, after a certain time, are to be permitted to inspect the prophetess; to whom the heads of the Jews and several physicians are likewise to be admitted. Lord Ellenborough is also one of the *Dramatis Personæ*; being appointed to perform the conspicuous part of witnessing the suckling of the child.

Mr. SHARP, the engraver, himself one of the FLATS, was ORDERED to engrave the portrait; and, like Cyrus, was mentioned by name. See Seven Dialogues with Satan, and Remarks on Church Prayers, with Sharp's Preface; also Fourth Book of Wonders.

But the best part of the story is yet to be unfolded. As Joseph the carpenter was directed to take the Virgin Mary to

ther will be brought to bed of her wonderful

wife, a husband is to be found for Joanna, who may adopt the miraculous child, though too late to be the real father, and not to be known by her after the manner of the world, until after the child is born. An affecting appeal is then made to the pockets of the sealed people, announcing a sixth and a seventh Book of Wonders, the one to record the marriage, and the other the delivery.

The consultation and opinion of seven wise men on the subject of the marriage, exhibit an instance of strange delusion, nay, of downright madness, beyond all that the world has ever witnessed or conceived.

“ Having been this day called together by the direction of Mrs. Joanna Southcott, to take into consideration her present situation, as announced in the Books of Wonders, the following question was proposed to us:—‘ How can the son
‘ who is to be born of her inherit as an heir, after the manner
‘ of men, without having an adopted father before he shall
‘ be born?’ In answer to this inquiry we say, that according to the laws of the land, the son so announced, cannot be a legitimate child, to inherit as an heir, after the manner of man, without a marriage union having taken place between her and some man, previously to the birth of such a son.” Signed, W. O. Pughe, Ben. Carder, T. Turpin, W. Sharp, J. Hows, Thed. Turpin, W. Tolhurst, June 4, 1814.” This opinion was gravely agreed to by Colonel Harwood, Mr. W. Tozer, and R. Goldsmith. Then follows the decision of Nath. Brassey Halhed, mentioned above as the friend and patron of Brothers, who, with J. Spring, thinks that, “ according to the laws of entail, the heir to real property must be lawfully begotten; but where there is a marriage, the law presumes this fact on the principle that ‘ Pater est quem nuptiæ demonstrant.’ ”

Surely human fatuity has here arrived at its ne plus ultra.

Shiloh is in this abominable publication stated to be “ a

offspring before the 12th of next January, and

son created by the power of the Father, which proceedeth from the Holy Ghost, to establish my kingdom (the Spirit speaks) in the end. It is I the Lord must give him power to go on conquering and to conquer, till the heathens fall before him; and thus I shall do in men, and by men who receive him, they will see the power given from on high, before the child is old enough to be any conqueror at all; because my power and my working, my ways and my decrees, which I shall bring round, will soon follow after his birth." P. 55, 56.

The Spirit has, in February last, ordered the making of the marriage clothes (Second Book of Wonders). The bridegroom, however, has not yet come forward, a clergyman in the West of England having been courted, and fought shy. As the nuptials are ordered to be celebrated by banns, and the computed period of delivery is the second week in October, the approaching few weeks from this period (3d of September) are big with important events.

Since the beginning of August nine medical men have inspected this woman, six of whom entertain no doubts as to the fact of her pregnancy. Dr. Sims, and Dr. Adams, of the Small-pox Hospital, are, however, not satisfied; but Dr. Reece has expressed his full conviction. It is certain that Tozer's pulpit declaration of his willingness to take a sacramental oath, that no man had *seen* or *spoken* to Joanna from October 1813 to August 1814, affords no proof of the pretended miracle. Cromwell extorted a promise from a royalist, whom he sent to the continent, that he would not see the King. The ambassador met his Majesty in the dark.

After all, Dr. Reece should beware how he misleads the public. I myself believe not one word respecting the pregnancy; and though not medical, and even refused, as I have been, the favour of an interview (which, indeed, I solicited on other accounts), I am entitled to say, that while the slightest doubt remained (and very strong reasons, it appears, have

thus confound the whole host of her adversaries and gainsayers*."

determined the judgment of Dr. Sims the opposite way), it was giving too powerful a sanction to this wide-spreading imposture, to deliver the positive opinion which Dr. R. has recorded.

* See Morning Chron. Aug. 6, 1814.

As I have presented the reader with an example of the taste in writing, evinced by one of Mrs. Southcott's opponents, it may not be amiss to subjoin a few displays of the beau idéal of composition, conceived in the imagination of the other. Mr. Hann chiefly directed his attack against the main fortress; but Mr. S. Lane has no less ably been engaged in pouring a furious cannonade upon one of the strongest out-works.

To be plain, I have already stated that the Reverend Hoadly Ash, D. D. has unfortunately lent his name to the Southcottian delusion. Against this Goliath, Mr. S. Lane, V. D. M. (which dark characters I pretend not to decypher, unless perhaps they are designed to signify *Velut David Minor*), steps boldly forth, "with the naked sword of unerring truth, a bag, a sling, and a few smooth stones from the brook." But let us listen to his own impassioned and eloquent threatenings. "I shall draw the broad-sword of irresistible truth, and willingly meet my adversary, come from what quarter he may; and should my opponent prove an *ASH*, as tall as a cedar, and as sturdy as an oak, with a double D on every bough; yet will I not fear his height, nor be alarmed at his stubbornness, but boldly lay the axe at the root thereof; when I have no doubt but every stroke will make the beholders acknowledge the two D's to signify, double destruction; death and damnation to the double deceived, who embrace the diabolical delusion of the infernal witch of an author of '*Strange Effects of Faith.*' Therefore, if I am replied to by a Dr. Ash, or Joanna Southcott, or the devil himself (who is the father of

The doctrines of Joanna Southcott are of so inconsistent and contradictory a nature, that to

both), 'tis of no consequence to me; as I am willing to face a whole herd of them, be they as numerous as the locusts which infested the land of Egypt."

While Mr. Lane, V. D. M. was inditing his book, he received the following epistle, bearing the Crewkerne post-mark, and dated 10th Dec. 1811.

" Mr. S. Lane, V. D. M.

" I recommend to you to read attentively the 160, 161, and 168 pages of the ' True Explanation of the Bible, published ' by Joanna Southcott,' and then read with a wish for a knowledge of the truth, the 18, 19, 20, 21 verses of the fifth chapter of the Prophet Isaiah; and then I am fully persuaded that you will see the pit that Satan hath dug for thee, thou Vain Deluded Man.

" Dost thou remember thy driving of pigs at Crediton?

" VERAX."

Mr. S. Lane having submitted this monitory and reproachful composition to the inspection of a privy council of his friends, they were unanimously of opinion, that the handwriting was none other than that of Dr. H. Ash himself. In his reply, he accordingly takes this fact for granted. His observations in point of doctrine, however, we shall pass by for the present: in order to direct attention to his vein of sore invective, in parrying that home thrust conveyed in the sting of the epigram.

" Dost thou remember thy driving of pigs at Crediton?"

" I answer, no, Verax, I do not indeed; as I was never farther west than Axminster, with a fishing party: and as to driving pigs, I never understood that employ, except of such wallowing swine as wash themselves in the mire of Joanna's doctrines. But I well remember in Mark, v. 13, of the devils, by divine permission, entering and driving a whole herd of swine into the sea; where they were all choked; and

ascertain them will be no easy task. If we receive the testimony of one well acquainted with her writings, they may be arranged under the following heads :

1st, She is come to warn the world of the near approach of the millennium : and 2dly, To seal the people for the enjoyment of this period, to the amount of one hundred and forty-four thousand, according to the Scripture.

3dly, She claims the promise that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.

4th, She is to hand the good fruit over to man,

with God's assistance, I will drive Joanna, with her mad doctors, the learned Verax, and all their deluded confederates, who will make a noble herd of Satan's swine, from every lurking hole they may seek for refuge, until Jehovah commissions Satan to drive them headlong into the sea of perdition, to be choked in the smoke of their own torments, and pressed down under the wrath of Heaven for ever and ever. When this learned Crewkerne writer had ended his epistle of wholesome advice, being ashamed of his name, and for reasons secretly known to himself, and with a view, no doubt, to display his learning and to conceal his wickedness, he signs Verax ; but, alas for poor Verax ! he forgot how truly this word unfolded his pedigree, that he was descended from a witch or a wise woman."

The force of this etymological remark of Mr. Lane's, I must leave it to the learned reader to discover. It is but justice, however, to the V. D. M. to add, that he deprecates all comments on his style and language, professing himself to be "no academian," as he has it ; "but a man who counts all human acquirements to be only dross and dung."

as Eve formerly imparted to him the evil fruit; thereby becoming a second Eve, as Christ was a second Adam.

5th, The woman and her seed (Joanna and Shiloh) are, at the commencement of the millennium, to chain down Satan for a thousand years.

To reply to these doctrines in systematic order, were to allow to blasphemy, or insanity, far more weight than they deserve.

That this world will one day come to an end, is certain; that many learned and wise men have believed in a millennium, we have already shown: if these events be in futurity, therefore, they *MUST* needs come one day to pass; and if pretended prophets continue to arise from time to time, some one will assuredly, in the end, guess right. Further, I could, without difficulty, deliver my mind from any prejudice against God's employing an obscure individual as the chief instrument in effecting this great revolution of the world. It is not more unlikely, than that the son of a low attorney, in a petty town of Corsica, should come to hold in terror all the nations of the earth, connect himself with ancient royalty, overthrow long-established thrones and dynasties, and appoint his three brothers kings of Spain, Westphalia, and Holland. And as to the extraction of an infant from the womb of a female who has attained her sixty-fifth year, I am not profane enough to deny, that this is

completely within the power of God. Of the millenary doctrine itself I would speak with all respect. I am inclined to think it true: it is certainly consolatory and harmless. Further, it is a highly interesting and allowable employment of reason, to examine and follow the current of historical events, and to compare them with the prophetic declarations of Scripture. We know that, in scriptural language, time signifies the days of a prophetic year; so that the time, times, and half a time, or $360 + 720 + 180$ years, mentioned in the book of Daniel, amount to 1260 years, corresponding to the forty-two months of Rev. ii. 2, or the one thousand two hundred and three score days of Rev. ii. 3; these months and days being also numbered as years*. At the end of a great period of 1260 years, there is reason, therefore, to believe that some marvellous revolutions will take place. But so uncertain is it when this great period began, that men of the most profound learning and accurate research have differed by many years in their calculations. Neither are divines agreed, whether the opening of the seals, and the pouring out of the vials, mentioned in the mysterious Apocalypse, are to be regarded as synchronical or consecutive. Wise men, therefore, may employ their leisure in speculating on this topic; yet speculation will, after all, be, in great

* See also Rev. xii. 6, 14; and xiii. 5.

measure, conjectural. But for individuals to clothe themselves in the spirit of prophecy, and to pretend to immediate revelations, is, in the highest degree, presumptuous and wicked. By what criterion can these pretenders determine, whether their dreams and impressions (if they HAVE indeed dreamt or been impressed) are not the hallucinations of a disordered understanding, or, like ordinary dreams and reveries, the suggestions of a roving fancy? How is it to be ascertained, whether they have not been communicated by the spirit of delusion and darkness; that Satan may not have transformed himself into an angel of light? (2 Cor. xi. 14.)

To this the obvious answer is, the prophet is judged by the event;—where the revelation is false, the prediction will not be verified.

Let us apply this test, then, to the predictions of Joanna Southcott. Of no inconsiderable number among these, the fulfilment OUGHT, already, to have come to pass. At Exeter, in 1803, she prophesied, that her sealed manuscripts should be demanded in the following year by the great, and learned, and powerful: they have never been so demanded. In the “Strange Effects of Faith,” p. 128, she prophesied that, in three years after, 1801, “the major part of our land would be convinced that the Lord hath spoken by her.” In the first edition she said, “This was said to me;” in the second, when the prediction had failed, she

laid it upon her own judgment. She prophesied the death of Miss Taylor's father *; but it did not take place, and Miss Taylor deserted her. She prophesied a famine in the year 1804, and no famine ensued. She prophesied that, in the same year, every judgment necessary to prepare the world for entering on the millennium should take place; and nothing particular happened. In 1792, she had declared, that fifteen years only would be added to her own life; and she is alive in 1814. She prophesied that, in 1805, and, afterwards, in 1811, England should be redeemed and made completely happy. She wrote to the House of Commons, in 1803, declaring, that if Brothers were not released from prison, England should be destroyed. Brothers is now at liberty, and deeply regrets his past frenzies. She declared that Ann Moore, the fasting woman, was said by the Spirit to be a sign of a predicted famine †. Thanks to Mr. Gisburne, the imposture of Ann Moore has long ceased to be gainful. In 1808, she prophesied that Bath should be destroyed by an earthquake; and, for several days, not a chaise or pair of horses was to be obtained within a stage of that city. In 1810, she foretold for England, famine, and pestilence, and the sword. In 1811, the devil was to be wholly banished from England. In 1807, she was to lead the Jews from London to Jerusalem.

* See the Trial.

† See True Explanations of the Bible, p. 608.

In 1811, Buonaparte was to land in England, and to be put to death by her sealed people.

From these specimens the sealed people may judge, whether her assertion, that “her believers can bring forward more solid proofs from her prophecies in twenty years, than can be proved from the Gospel to have been fulfilled in 1814 years *,” is not an impudent falsehood, and a daring blasphemy. Let them discern what credit is to be reposed in her present prediction, that before the end of October she shall, miraculously, in her 64th year, bring forth Shiloh, the new Elias, the Prince of Peace, the King of Salem, and the Son of Christ.

But, unfortunately, the disciples of Joanna elude this mode of reasoning, by affirming, that the prophecies are *conditional*; and the instance of Jonah’s prediction, that Nineveh should be destroyed, is produced to prove that a prophecy may fail, without impeaching the veracity of the prophet. Now, with respect to the prophecy of Jonah, it must be remarked, 1st, That impenitence, the cause of the foretold destruction, was removed within the forty days by the faith of the people; so that the justice of God was concerned in withdrawing the menaced calamity: and, 2dly, That God, at the same time, displayed his power in hastening the miraculous growth of the gourd.

* Fifth Book, p. 26.

Where are Joanna Southcott's miracles, to compensate the failure of her prophecies? and what intervened to pledge the justice of the Deity towards preventing the demand of her papers, the death of Mr. Taylor, the destruction of Bath, the march of the Jews, or the arrival of Buonaparte?

It has been already hinted, that part of this flagrant imposture consists in the distribution of those mysterious seals, which, it is pretended, will secure to their possessors the enjoyment of the millennium. These are said to have been sold at various prices, from a guinea to half-a-crown each; but the delusion being strongly prevalent, while the number of the sealed is set forth as fixed at 144,000, the gainfulness of the traffic must be apparent, if any sum, however small, have been demanded*. Half a sheet of paper is delivered, being folded up, and stamped with a seal bearing the letters J.C. inscribed over two stars†. These characters, it is understood, signify Joanna and Christ, the one being the morning, and the other the evening star. On the back are written the words, "Not to be broken

* Mr. Wetherell, in a letter I have received from him, affirms, "that the seals are a free gift, having never been sold BY BELIEVERS; and that the signing also is free." Without impeaching this gentleman's veracity, I may be permitted to state, that various concurrent testimonies prove him to be misinformed in the present instance.

† See Fourth Book of Wonders, p. 36.

open:" but several persons, prompted by curiosity, or incredulity, have made bold to disobey this mandate; and have discovered, underneath, the following blasphemous passport:

"The sealed of the Lord: the Elect Precious. Man's Redemption. To inherit the tree of life. To be made heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ. JOANNA SOUTHCOTT."

The sealing has been stopped by order of the Spirit, since 1808, and will not be renewed till a counter-order shall be received*. In the mean time, all people demanding seals are invited to sign their names at head-quarters; and the number of those signing lunatics amounted, in June last, to 6400 and odds.

The seal was found one day by the direction of the Spirit, who acquainted the prophetess, in the Devonshire dialect, that it lay in the skivet of her box.

The 12th chapter of Revelations, which Joanna pretends to be verified in her person, describes her as having the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars; and as fleeing into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, and where they feed her a thousand two hundred and threescore days. How the moon is under her feet, and how she is clothed with the sun, shall be presently rendered apparent. As to

* In 1804, 8144, and, in 1807, 14,000 had been sealed. The Lord's Prayer was, at this period, ordered to be added to the sealed papers. See Third and Fifth Books of Wonders.

the other part of the prophecy, "the wilderness in which she has a place," has been, for several years past, a snug mansion in Weston Place, near the Small Pox Hospital.

In exposing the fallacy of those shreds and shadows of arguments by which the sealed people support their extraordinary delusion, I shall here relate the substance of a conference I held with one of them, Mrs. Munday, a person of the most irreproachable character, on the evening of Sunday, 14th August 1814, in the house of Mr. F. in Hornsey, and in the presence of several respectable individuals. During this conversation, which lasted about two hours, Mrs. M. launched forth into accounts of her own dreams and whisperings, and into an inexhaustible variety of other extraneous matter, with a volubility of which I shall not pretend to convey the remotest idea; and many a time answers came,

"Ere answer knew what question would:"

but the leading points discussed it may, perhaps, be interesting and useful to detail.

I began by assuring her, that I had no design whatever of treating her with ridicule, or of hurting her feelings, and that I respected sincerity under every form of religion, especially when combined with a moral conduct so excellent as hers.

After this the following were the principal questions and replies: "Have you been at church to-

day* ?"—“No : I have the church within me.”—
“To come to the point at once, Mrs. M. I understand that you are one of the sealed people ?”—“I confess it.”—“On that account I could wish to have some little conversation with you, and if you shall succeed in convincing me as to the truth of your opinions, I shall not scruple to become your proselyte ; I have, however, I must own, a great many doubts, which must be surmounted in the first instance : here is a Bible ; let us turn to those passages by which the mission of Joanna is supported ; and, first, to the 7th chapter of Revelations, where we have an account of the numbers sealed. Now you know, that you possess your seal upon a sheet of paper ; but I read, in the 3d verse, that all the persons here spoken of as sealed, were sealed upon their foreheads.”—“Yes, Sir ; because the forehead is the seat of knowledge.”—“That interpretation I cannot admit of ; both parts of the sentence must be literal, or both allegorical ; if it is a literal seal, it is a literal forehead : if it is not a literal forehead, it is not a literal seal. But let us pass on, Joanna Southcott pretends that she is commissioned to distribute seals, to the amount of 144,000,

* This question by Mrs. F. who was alone present at the beginning of the interview. This lady, my esteemed friend, ought to lead a sect of her own. When the F-ll-rites, or goers about doing good, on Christian principles, shall have swallowed up all other denominations, then, and not till then, I prophesy the millennium. Mrs. F. was the first who passed under the Highgate Archway, which gave occasion to the following bon mot : “Mrs. F. was an angel before, but she is now an ARCHangel.”

after which the millennium will be enjoyed. Now, in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th verses of this chapter, it is clear that the whole 144,000 persons sealed are Jews; there is not one Gentile amongst them; but Joanna has sealed you, who are a Gentile, and numbers who are Gentiles; it therefore follows, that she has gone much beyond her pretended commission, and that your seal is not worth twopence." This remark appeared to stagger and perplex her exceedingly; but she got off, in her usual way, by some allegorical explanation. "But, Mrs. M. let us proceed to the very next verse: 'After this I beheld, and lo! a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindred, and people, &c.' These people were Gentiles: now, since this innumerable multitude are to inherit the kingdom of heaven (or the kingdom of righteousness), either they are sealed, or they are not sealed: if they are sealed, Joanna must be telling a lie, in saying she is confined to the sealing of 144,000; and if they are not sealed, there is a way of getting into this kingdom without a seal; and hence it follows, that a seal is useless, and nothing worth."—"What you have said as to their being Jews, is very true and very important, and I shall represent it; but I am a weak woman, and cannot answer such perplexing questions: this I know, that I will believe in Joanna, because I am sure that, without the Spirit, she could not produce such writings as she dic-

tates ; however, in a few weeks there will be a grand blow-up ; a blow-up to all objections.”—“ Suppose, now, that this Shiloh should not be brought forth ; would your faith, in that case, be shaken ? ” —“ I would not, Sir, afflict myself by believing the failure of the prophecy to be possible.”—“ There is no harm in supposing it possible. I ask, what would you then be disposed to say ? ”—“ Well ! I should forgive her : for I could not bring my mind to forget, that she has already been fully proved to be a true prophetess in many things.”—“ In what one particular has she ever prophesied truly ? ”—“ In the First Book of Wonders, she prophesied the birth of this very child ; she foretold it so very far back as in 1794.”—“ I have not seen that prophecy, and must, therefore, express my doubts for the present * ; but I can mention in return, to you, a great many of her prophecies that were never fulfilled.”—“ Satan, I grant, was permitted to mislead her twice.”—“ You grant that : why, then, by the same rule, do you not think it possible, that she may have been deceived by Satan all along ? ”—“ These two instances were intended to chide her doubts as to the truth of her own predictions.”—“ A strange way, Mrs. Munday, of confirming her belief in their TRUTH, to render a couple of them false.

* N.B. I have since read the book in question ; and the whole quibble rests on the strength of a few obscure lines of bad verse, in which two boys are introduced, representing the Jews and the Gentiles.

But let me now ask some questions relative to this expected child: the prophecy in which this miraculous birth is said to be founded, occurs in the 12th chapter of the book of Revelations: Joanna gives herself out to be the woman clothed with the sun: I don't rightly apprehend how she can be said to be clothed with the sun."—"She is clothed with the sun of righteousness."—"Then, how has she the moon under her feet?"—"She has herself proved that the devil is in the moon; and the devil is under her feet; therefore, the moon is under her feet."—"That indeed is a very strange account of the matter. If you had said, the moon is in the devil, and, therefore, since the devil is under her feet, the moon must be under her feet, it might stand for an ingenious answer, since the greater contains the less, and both might be figurative expressions: but the moon is up in the heavens; and if the devil be in the moon there, he cannot be under Joanna's feet."—"Joanna Southcott is the second Eve: sin came first from the first Eve; and, therefore, the good fruit must come through the second."—"You have here introduced a personage of whom, I must confess, I never heard any mention whatever in Scripture: on the contrary, it is written, 'that as in ADAM all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive.'"—"Shiloh, the child to be born, is the Prince of Peace: our Saviour never was the Prince of Peace; he came not, as he says himself, to send peace, but a sword."—"You say

that this child is not the Saviour?"—"Yes."—"And you say that the Saviour is God?"—"Yes."—"And you say that this child is the person mentioned in the prophecy, as the Prince of Peace?"—"Yes."—"Very well, then, Mrs. Munday; you will recollect, that that same prophecy of Isaiah (ch. ix. ver. 6), which speaks of the Prince of Peace, calls the same person, whoever he is, the Mighty God. If Shiloh, then, be the Prince of Peace, he is the Mighty God. Is not this robbing the Saviour of his right? Is not this blasphemy*?"—"I cannot say, Sir. I find several contradictions in Scripture, which have very often perplexed my mind considerably more than that: it is said that no man hath seen God at any time; and yet it is elsewhere said, that Moses spake unto him face to face. It is said, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, and yet both Enoch and Elijah were conveyed thither in the flesh."—"These are very vain cavils: God has no FACE; and the obvious meaning of the former passage is, Moses communicated with God as intimately as a man speaking face to face with another man: and, as to the second passage, you have cited two uncommon and miraculous exceptions against a general rule: I might as well say, that the passage, 'It is appointed unto all men

* That this assertion is that of Joanna herself, see the Fifth Book of Wonders, p. 41 and 53, where the child to be born is thrice styled the Prince of Peace.

‘once to die,’ is perplexing, because it applied not to Enoch and Elijah!”—“How has our Saviour *actually* been the Prince of Peace?”—“Is he not the Prince of Peace by making peace between a sinner and his God? Is he not the Prince of Peace by conveying peace, in a sense of pardon through his blood, to the guilty and troubled mind? Is he not the Prince of Peace by reason of that mutual harmony, in which those disciples must dwell, who fulfil his commandment, ‘Love one another?’” —“Say what you will, Sir, I am unshaken in my belief in Joanna; for I have myself had strange dreams and whisperings, and I will maintain, that this Son, to be born, is the Comforter and the Spirit of Truth, whom our Saviour promised to send into the world: he can be none other; for have his disciples ever yet experienced comfort? I, for instance, do my best to serve God, and yet I have no comfort. Have the disciples ever yet been guided unto all truth? Look abroad to the numbers of religious errors, and tell me.”—“Our Saviour said to his Apostles, before he left the world, ‘I will send my Comforter unto you: I will send you the Spirit of Truth, who shall guide you unto all truth:’ this Spirit and this Comforter, then, must have been promised, and must have come, to the APOSTLES; he did so on the day of Pentecost: he has been the Comforter ever since, to you, and me, and all, by being the author of every thing, at all good, that we do; and Joanna South-

cott is, by consequence, a gross blasphemer, in conferring this honour on another, and that other this predicted child. Besides, the disciples *have been* guided into all truth : it is their own fault that some have not followed the guide. Mrs. Munday, you are going upon most dangerous grounds, and so is Joanna Southcott, and so are all that believe in her ; we are fallible creatures, and, if her relation be false, the consequences are most serious ; and look to them : we have had an ample revelation of God's will in the Bible ; and you remember how it is written, that ' If any man ' shall add unto these things, God shall add unto ' him all the plagues that are written in this book.' And again, ' For without are dogs, and sorcerers, ' and murderers, and whosoever loveth and maketh ' a lie.' "—" But, Sir, we are told, that there is to be another revelation."—" And what title has Joanna Southcott to pretend to it ? We know that of the end of the world, of the day, and the hour, knoweth no man ; no, not the angels, but the Father alone ; and yet here is a woman who presumes to fix it."—" She fixes neither a day, nor an hour, but the latter end of harvest."—" This is picking faults with words : a person who fixes a month, or a few weeks, may be affirmed to fix both the day and the hour."—" But she fixes not the day of judgment : she only fixes the date of the millennium."—" If she fixes the one, she fixes the other : for, as the millennium is to last a thou-

sand years, to say it will begin in harvest, is to fix the day of judgment in a thousand harvests *."

I will freely confess, that in the course of this conversation, the sealed woman completely foiled me in three particulars; and I was obliged, in all these cases, to have recourse to her own constant stratagem of answering with a fly-off and a flourish. These I shall now mention, subjoining what I consider as satisfactory answers, although I was, unfortunately, not prepared with them just at the time.

"Our Saviour," said she, "is the rod out of the stem of Jesse, mentioned in Isaiah, xi. 1; but we there read, that besides this rod, a branch shall go out of his roots."

To this I answer, that as a rod from a stem has itself no roots, the branch cannot be supposed to spring out of the rod, i. e. Shiloh from Christ. The expression is only a repetition of the first clause in different words; an exceedingly common figure in Scripture. The Hebrew word *Sheresh* signifies both a root, and a branch growing out of a root; a remark which throws light on verse 10th of the same chapter, where Christ is himself called the root; and upon Isaiah, liii. 3; and Rev. xxii.

* I pass by several other points which were touched upon—How Joanna was to be fed 1260 days in the wilderness—how her child, as soon as he was born, was to be caught up unto God—how she was to receive two eagles wings; and how the dragon was to spout a flood of water after her.

16; in both of which passages the figure is repeated *. These observations should teach us to beware of building a doctrine upon a single figurative expression.

Again, Mrs. M. observed, "You will remark there is to be **ANOTHER** Comforter." This I now find was a very artful answer to my having reminded her of the passage, John, xiv. 26, "But the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send unto you, he shall teach you all things." But attend to the sixteenth verse of the same chapter, to which she went back to find the words of her answer. Our Saviour speaks to his Apostles, "But I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, &c." He himself, being about to be crucified, was the one Comforter, of whom they were speedily to be deprived; and the other Comforter, ver. 16, even the Spirit of Truth, ver. 17, is the Holy Ghost himself; ver. 26, who should instruct the Apostles more amply in divine truth, than they had been able to bear during the lifetime of the Saviour.

But at all events, the phrase, "another Com-

* The verse immediately succeeding, speaks of the rod and branch as one and the same: "The Spirit shall rest upon **HIM**." If Christ and Shiloh were different persons, this word would evidently be "**THEM**." Christ's dwelling at Nazareth fulfils this prophecy in his person; for Netzer signifies "a branch:" and also that of Job, vii. 29, Netzer being "preserver."

forter," would not have altered the blasphemy of Joanna Southcott's account of her expected son; for she talks of him as THE Comforter; THE Spirit of Truth, who has promised to guide men into all truth *.

Lastly, my opponent urged the passage, 1 Peter, i. 13, where a grace is spoken of, "to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ:"—"Hence," said she, "as Saint Peter wrote after the death of Christ, it is plain that another revelation is to be expected." Now, the Greek happens to be, *ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει*, &c. i. e. the grace that IS BROUGHT to you, IN OR BY the revelation of Jesus Christ †.

* See Fifth Book of Wonders, p. 54, 55; and Fourth Book, p. 33 and 39.

† In consequence of this conversation, Mrs. M. on going home, wrote down the chief arguments with which she had been staggered, and submitted them to Mr. W——ll, a respectable surgeon at Highgate, who has unhappily suffered his mind to be perverted by the new delusion. Her application led to an interview betwixt Mr. W. and myself; but though I found him well versed in Scripture, and prepared to give something resembling a reason for his hope, his reasons were nothing better than specious fallacies. As nearly as I can recollect, the substance of our dialogue was as follows. With respect to the 144,000 Jews, he argued, that in consequence of intermarriages between Jews and Gentiles, many persons would shortly be found to belong to the twelve tribes, who imagined themselves aliens from the seed of Abraham. I replied, that the explanation would by no means answer the objection; since, in the passage of Revelations, the 144,000 were unequivocal Jews, of uncontaminated blood; being set in opposition to a

I shall now take leave of this disgrace to the police of the metropolis, by pointing out a few

vast multitude of Gentiles; and that to call favoured Gentiles concealed Jews, was to abolish this distinction, and to destroy the limitation to 144,000. "No second Eve, it is true," said Mr. W. "is mentioned in the Sacred Volume; and yet a woman, it is in several places recorded, will have a miraculous visitation in the latter days. Moreover, it is the seed of the woman who shall bruise the serpent's head: Christ was not the seed of the woman, but the offspring of the Holy Ghost; neither did he bruise the serpent's head, for sin still prevails." I replied, that "St. Luke's tracing of our Lord's genealogy, on the mother's side, up to Adam, plainly points him out as the seed of the woman mentioned in Genesis; that the Apostles continually reason on this hypothesis: that to bruise is not to extinguish, and, therefore, the utter abolition of sin was not necessary to the fulfilment of the prophecy."—"I understand," said he, "that prophecy, and several others, to signify the destruction of the power of Satan in the person of the individual referred to. Christ was a short time on earth, and he himself did very little; the prophecy cannot have been fulfilled or completed in him."—"It certainly was. A prophecy of that kind must have been delivered in relation to the moral agency of man. The power of sin is destroyed with reference to all those who by faith and repentance avail themselves of the bruising of the serpent's head by Christ. Such a prophecy is fulfilled when it is set in the way of fulfilment."—"It is evident that the Apostles themselves looked for a further revelation. St. Paul says, 'Now I see through a glass darkly; but, then, face to face.'"—"Then, signifies, in eternity; not when Joanna Southcott comes into the world. It signifies, when faith shall cease in sight, and hope in fruition."—"The Apostles were mistaken; they knew not what to think: many of them expected that their own

instances of the nonsense, blasphemy, and artifice, contained in the writings of "our spiritual mother."

generation should not pass away before the day of judgment."—"It is very clear that St. Peter did not: he reproved this very impatience: 'a thousand years are with the Lord as one day.' It is presumptuous, it is unscriptural, to affirm that the Apostles were deceived. St. Paul on one occasion says, 'I speak as a man.' Is not this an express reference to all his other communications as inspired? The passages you allude to, 'Some here shall not taste of death, &c.' and, 'This generation shall not pass away, &c.' were set down by the Evangelists as words spoken by Christ. They give no comment: we ought not to pronounce that they thought of the phrases otherwise than as referring, one to the resurrection, and the other to the destruction of Jerusalem."—"Joanna Southcott's works require deep study."—"I have read a considerable number of them: to-day I read this passage, 'As by the disobedience of the woman Paradise was lost; so by the perfect obedience of the woman must it be regained.' I confess to you, Mr. W. I shuddered while I read such words."—"That is because your eyes are not yet opened."—"Again; one of the passages on which this woman rests her power of sealing, is Ephes. iv. 30, 'Grieve not the Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed, &c.' She has begun to seal in the nineteenth century. We read not of that work as ever carried on before: yet these Ephesians, nearly 1800 years ago, are told that they are **ALREADY** sealed."—"There is a literal and a figurative sealing."—"At this rate you may make the Scriptures say any thing. If there be a figurative or spiritual sealing, and it is sufficient, why should there be any literal one?"—"We are believers in universal redemption: many may be saved who are not sealed; but they will not inherit the millennium."—"I find likewise, that many may be sealed

First, as to their nonsense. We are told in the seventh chapter of the Apocalypse, that 144,000 out of the several tribes of Israel, were

who are not saved. If salvation may be attained without sealing, and sealing does not ensure salvation, I cannot see very well what your seals are good for."—"They will ensure to the sealed people the reign of the saints on earth: they are obedient sons; a father may love two sons, and yet may evince a fonder affection towards the child who fully obeys him."—"True; if that obedience be required to a moral commandment; but not if the son's understanding cannot be satisfied that the injunction or proposition actually issued from the father."—"What do you conceive meant by the leopard lying down with the lamb, and a little child leading them?"—"A figurative expression, denoting the cessation of wars and animosities."—"It is partly literal, signifying the mitigation of the savage ferocity of animals; and partly figurative, intimating the concord of nations, and their being ruled over by the child TO BE BORN."—"If it be literal, it signifies no particular child, but a child, any child, to describe the harmlessness of the animals. If it be figurative, it is all figurative: if the leopard and lamb denote kingdoms, the child is but a heightening of the metaphor."—"There has hitherto been no manifestation of the Holy Ghost personally: how could you convince a Jew, or unbeliever, as to the truth of the Athanasian doctrines?"—"I would turn to the story of Ananias and Sapphira, 'Thou hast lied unto the Holy Ghost;' and in the next verse, 'Thou hast lied unto God.'"—"But the Holy Ghost has never been manifested in a separate form or character, as the second Person was in Christ."—"He was separately manifested at the baptism of Christ: he hovered as a dove over the second Person, while the first Person cried, 'This is my beloved Son;' [neither was this the mere power or agency of the Father: 'the Spirit maketh intercession for us' (Rom. viii. 26): an INTERCESSOR supposes two, as a mediator does."

to be sealed by an angel, on their foreheads. These 144,000 are taken from the mass of the Jews, who are, at this day, computed to amount, at the lowest calculation, to 2,500,000: but Joanna is stated to have, on one occasion, sealed all the Jews by a coup de main. Now, these filling up much more than the warranted number, I should like to know by what authority this dispensing of seals is to be continued*.

This last sentence I am not certain that I then advanced, but I think I did.] “You see, Sir, what Joanna says is exceedingly strong. If the visitation fails to produce a son this year, then Jesus Christ is not the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary.”—“That is Joanna’s own blasphemy: she presupposes the visitation’s being as true in itself as the Ave Maria. I deny the premises.”—“The second week in October will settle all. I am to be present at the accouchement; and, if a son is not produced, I shall own the whole to be a most blasphemous delusion.”

Mr. W. drew some nice and hardly intelligible distinctions betwixt the child’s being the Holy Ghost, and coming in the power of the Holy Ghost. I replied, that that was precisely the blasphemy of J. Naylor, who received the hosannahs as due to the Christ within him. Mrs. M. began to relate her visions, and was rebuked by Mr. W. But why are not Mrs. M.’s visions as good as our spiritual mother’s?

Since writing the above account, a pamphlet has fallen into my hands, infinitely more nonsensical, artful, and impious, than any of the books I have yet met with. It is entitled, “Scriptures which show for what Christ died, and which show his second Coming in 1812.” It is written to encourage the signing, and refers to Mr. Tozer, the agent.

* To chain down Satan is one of the objects of Joanna’s mission; and in this she is to have the assistance of one Basil

“ It is finished !” said our blessed Saviour upon the cross : “ But all is not finished,” declares the Spirit by Joanna, “ before the redemption of man has taken place, before Satan’s power is destroyed *.”

In page 29 of the *Strange Effects of Faith*, it is asserted, that the second advent of our Lord Jesus Christ is past ; and that he is come in the form of a woman † ! Yet, in many other parts of the prophetess’s writings, it is declared, that before this second advent shall take place, the millennium, or the reign of Shiloh for a thousand years, shall elapse ‡.

Bruce, who is the angel mentioned in the twentieth chapter of the Revelations. See Hann’s Life.

* Fifth Book, p. 27.

† “ A woman here I am made.” See communications on the last letter of Mr. Brothers.

Again,

“ For in the Spirit here, I say, I’m come ;

And you may find me in the woman’s form.”

Fourth Book, p. 58.

‡ In commenting on the words, “ Behold, I come quickly !” the Spirit is made to ask, “ Did I come quickly in the days of the Apostles ?” but he is not made to explain how he can be affirmed to come more quickly now §.

Every page in the Third Book of Wonders is a compound of absurdity and impiety. “ Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,” is construed as signifying Shiloh, the second Son ||.

Six thousand years were to have elapsed before the millen-

§ True Explanation of the Bible, p. 597.

|| P. 13.

But, enough of this sect-leader's nonsense: let us add a word or two as to her blasphemy. The Spirit is made to say,

“ Now, Joanna, thee I'll answer:

In the green tree this was done;

Thou must suffer, like thy Master,

For the stubborn sins of men.

Their chastisement is laid on **THEE**;

By **THY STRIPES** they heal'd must be,

If they will be heal'd at all.”

Here does this blasphemous wretch appropriate to herself a prophecy, relating exclusively to the Messiah; and although we know that there is none other name under heaven given unto men, whereby we may attain salvation, save only the name of Christ, our chastisement is to be laid on Joanna Southcott, and by her stripes we are healed. Again, in the *Strange Effects of Faith*, p. 276, “ Now, how do you prove your Bibles, where you say, that death, past on man, came first by the woman? Then it was by the woman all died,

nium; but, for the elect's sake, these days were shortened. And who is the elect? It is the son of man: the son revealed to Joanna*.

Our Saviour's beautiful comparison of the temporary despondence of the Apostles, at the death of their Lord, and their subsequent joy at his resurrection, and after the day of Pentecost, to a woman travailing with child, and rejoicing that a male child is born, is applied (*Fourth Book*, p. 39) to Shiloh, the male child to be born of Joanna.

* P. 31.

and by the woman all are to be made alive. So that let no one look upon this child as a new Saviour, &c.; for were this Son to be put to death, as I was on the cross, then fatal destruction must come upon all; because there remaineth no more offering for sin *."

Our spiritual mother's ARTIFICE is akin to her blasphemy and nonsense. Like Touchstone, she is of opinion, that your "if" is an excellent peace-maker. Much virtue in an "if." She had prophesied her father's death. The event did not follow; and she then introduced the Spirit, de-

* Fifth Book, p. 55.

In the Fourth Book of Wonders, it is denied, p. 3 and 4, that Christ raised the temple of his body in three days, and took it up, after laying it down, by his own power (John, ii. 19—21; and John, x. 17, 18); while it is affirmed, that this declaration is to be fulfilled in raising up the son of Joanna Southcott.

The Third and Fourth Books of Wonders are replete with shocking and disgusting blasphemy.

"When I was born" (our Saviour speaks, p. 10, b. iii.), "was I the man-child that brought in the great deliverance?"

St. John represents our Saviour as the light shining in darkness; but Joanna (Fourth Book, p. 36) is "to tread all the light that shineth in darkness under her feet, and to bring the perfect light to man."

Christ took up his life in three days after his crucifixion; but this impudent deceiver asks, in his name (Third Book, p. 5), "How can I take up my life again, without coming as a father, to take it up in a son?"

Throughout these Third and Fourth Books, her expected son is again and again called the Comforter and the Spirit of Truth.

claring, "It was a weakness in thee to expect thy father would die in that year; when I had said, he should die if I began with a famine *."

She prophesied a famine in 1801. The event did not take place. She then relates a dream, that the famine would only ensue, if no inquiries should be made respecting her mission; and as she received three letters about May, in that year, from the Rev. Stanhope Bruce, the Rev. Thomas Webster, and the Rev. T. P. Foley, inquiring after the truth, for their sakes the Lord stopped the rain in the harvest; and she now saw that these were the feathered fowl (gulls, or pigeons, perhaps), whom she had seen in a dream †.

Even the expected child's leading the Jews into the promised land, is suspended upon the same convenient monosyllable ‡. He is to restore them to their country, IF they will receive him. And, indeed, already they have afforded some strong

* See Caution to the Sealed.

† This same famine was then deferred to the three following years. THAT failed; and she got off by saying, that following did not mean in succession, and that nobody knew what was meant by years §. Then she foretold that the sword, the pestilence, and a famine, should befall this country in 1810; THAT failed; and she had recourse to the old pretence, that she never meant that the three visitations should come in a straight line.

‡ Third Book of Wonders, p. 4 and 9.

§ See True Explanation of the Bible, p. 616.

reason to suppose that the kingdom will not be restored to Israel at this time *.

* An annunciation of the prodigy, accompanied by the deceiver's portrait, has been made to the chief Rabbis in the several English towns; and they have been ordered to receive no one in the name of Joanna Southcott, who comes not with the probate of Mr. Cosins's will in her hand. But the answer of the Jews from Sheffield was, that they believed not in Jesus Christ any more than in Joanna Southcott; and that the whole was an infamous deception. The Chief Priest at Liverpool replied, that he would not insult the understandings of his brethren, by even calling them together on so nonsensical a business. An interpreter of the law in London observed, with a sly banter, that "he would pass no judgment till the shild vash born." But the happiest and most courteous response was made by a Jew at Birmingham to the Rev. Mr. Bradley, whom we have to mention with surprise and regret. "Good news for the Jews," said this dishonour to the Establishment; "your Messiah is about to be born."—"If it be good newsh for the Jewsh, Mishter Bradley, it will be bad newsh for the Christiansh; for you will be all cut off †."

In mentioning Mr. Bradley I must recur to the Birmingham chalice, which he seems to have had the honour of presenting, and of inscribing with the four lines, above quoted, from Pope's Messiah:

"The Son shall finish what his short-lived Sire begun, &c."

A wise head writes from Liverpool, that he should like to know who this son is, if it be not the child expected? He takes it for granted that the sire means the Saviour. Self-sufficient, egregious blockhead! Who does not see, at one glance, that these four lines are all parts of the same general anticipation? In the reign of peace no spoiler shall intervene to prevent any son from fulfilling the designs of any short-lived sire: and the same hand that ploughed shall reap the field. But if Pope be one of the prophets, Virgil must also be one: and let

† See Third and Fourth Books of Wonders,

Another mode of deception practised by this notorious swindler is, to assert that she had prophesied or known some event long before ; when in fact she had said not one syllable about it. In the Third Book of Wonders, p. 58, she refers to an intimation respecting her marriage by banns, with which the Spirit favoured her in 1794, but which she did not then insert : she now, however, recollects it. In the same manner she asserts, that from her early prophecies she had left out two lines of poetry, dictated to her respecting the birth of Shiloh, because she then did not understand them. If she had been always guided by this prudent rule, her works would have been compressed into an exceedingly narrow compass. Her writings abound in such deceptions. If she is asked to point out a prophecy before the event, she refers you to Stationers' Hall ; and you will there find many an event predicted, after it had come to pass.

To give half a dream in a pamphlet, and then suddenly breaking off, to promise the remainder of this dream in the next book, is a third species of this impostor's artifice. In this method of securing a second hearing, the old sorceress is as

the author of the Pollio inform Mrs. Southcott, that if the millennium shall commence in her lifetime, unless she retracts her deceptions,

Pauca tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis.

Would that I could add, for the sake of the poor man's pocket-money, with respect to the leaves of this Sibyl,

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas.

dexterous as Scheherazade. I have sickened over a great part of her nauseous trash, and I find this device continually resorted to. It is no joke to the pockets of the deluded poor. Most of the books have run through three editions *.

The last, and most convincing instance of Joanna's artifice is, her eagerness in courting persecution. She is always prophesying solemn trials, which never come to pass, and accusing the bishops because they take no notice of her. "The bishops," says she, "if I am an impostor, are guilty of my making thousands of proselytes." A certain king pardoned a nobleman three times, for three murders which he had committed. "He has only perpetrated one murder," said the royal jester; "if your Majesty had hung him after the first, the other two men would have been still alive: it is your Majesty's forbearance that has murdered THEM †."

* These dreams frequently concern the yawning of cats; probably Southcott, Townly, and Underwood: or pigs, led by the nose; evidently Mr. Hows, the pork-butcher.

† From these facts let it be judged, whether Doctors Sims and Reece, in the non-medical part of their reports, have not been too hasty in delivering it as their opinion, that this woman is no impostor? Is she not, more probably, like Mahomet, and some others of the same stamp, a composition of fanaticism and deceit?

If a child shall be brought forward and suckled, it is to be admitted, that the case of Ellen Ellis, of Beaumaris, who is alleged to have produced an infant at the age of seventy-two, is certainly not authentic. But Mr. Griffith, the rector of that place, writes, that, A. D. 1705, Catherine Jones brought forth

In the hope of counteracting this strong delusion, which has taken hold on many of the lower, and some of the higher classes, I shall subjoin for the consideration of the disciples of this sorceress, the following texts :

“ Woe to the WOMEN that sew pillows to all arm-holes: set thy face against the daughters of thy people which prophesy out of their own hearts. Ye say, The Lord saith it ; albeit I have not spoken.” Ezek. xiii. 2, 17, 18. “ Keep back thy servant from presumptuous sins.” Psalm

a son at sixty-two, and after living twenty-two years, died aged eighty-four, January 25, 1727. “ The issue of this parturition,” says he, “ I knew full well, when a boy at this school, near forty years ago.” All the professional gentlemen, whom I have consulted, unite in opinion, that pregnancy at sixty-four is not impossible. A woman is stated, by Mr. Ward, to have miscarried at sixty, eight or nine years ago, in Kent. There is also an instance, mentioned by Mr. Brodie, of a woman’s continuing to menstruate till her seventieth year. In the Douglas cause, the mother was fifty-four. The suckling of the child, however, will not, of itself, decidedly prove the ostensible to be the real mother ; for there are two well-authenticated cases in the Philosophical Transactions Abridged, vol. x. p. 206, and ditto for 1674, of women, between sixty and seventy, suckling infants not their own.

Even at this date, September 10, Mr. Wetherell, the surgeon, tells me by letter, that he is ignorant of the place which Joanna has chosen for her retirement. Does this look like the open dealing which has been paraded ? But if Mr. W. cannot inform me whereabouts is the new wilderness to which his pregnant patient has fled, I can acquaint *him*. She is with her friend Foley in Worcestershire ; and shame it is she should be. See Preface.

xix. 13. "Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing." Ezek. xiii. 3.

"The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night, when they shall say, Peace and safety, &c." 1 Thess. v. 2, 3.

"Refuse profane and OLD WIVES' fables." 1 Tim. iv. 7.

"For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they may believe a lie." 2 Thess. ii. 11 *.

* On the evening of Thursday, the 11th of August 1814, in order to possess sure grounds for whatever I should here assert, I attended the service at Joanna Southcott's chapel. The Liturgy was used, though with the remarkable præterition of the Creed. According to the new-fangled mode (which I am sorry to observe not decidedly condemned in a respectable publication, to which I wish well), the lessons were selected *ad libitum*; and the reader, further commenting on them as he went along, made the Bible speak precisely what language he pleased. The first was the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, in which the "branch from the root of Jesse," mentioned in the first verse, and "the little child, who shall lead the lion and the fatling," in the 6th, were both affirmed to be the child Shiloh, to be born this year of Joanna Southcott. In commenting on the second lesson, which was the second chapter of James, this person's ingenuity was still more singularly displayed; for, after he had read the verse, "Even so, faith without works is dead, being alone," he actually stopped short, and added, "Now the work of the present age is to come hither, and sign your names to the destruction of Satan." The desk service being concluded, a hymn was sung, extracted from the writings of Joanna, "our spiritual mother;" and, one of the congregation politely handing me a hymn-book, I had time to skim it over in different places, and to see in it disgraceful pas-

XXI. While the sects above mentioned in the early period of the Commonwealth, presented fan-

sages, which toleration itself ought not to allow. In the very first page occurs the following doxology :

To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
The one in power, the eternal Three,
Who shall restore a world that 's lost,
And call them back to Heaven and ME.

This verse is printed in italics, and underneath is a note, stating it to have been inserted at the express desire of Joanna.

But I fear I shall hardly obtain credit among my readers, when I attempt to describe the sermon; and, indeed, though I sate down to write this account immediately on returning home, I am almost tempted to question the testimony of my own senses. The blasphemy was truly awful; and I several times even dreaded, lest, by a sudden judgment, the falling chapel should bury the whole congregation under its ruins.

“ Shiloh, the child to be born this year of Joanna, is not the Saviour, but he is the branch, the Prince of Peace, the Comforter whom the Saviour promised to his disciples. The King himself is not to appear for a thousand years; but in the mean time, Shiloh is to officiate as the Prince Regent. He is to establish the millennium, to turn all kingdoms to God, and to be esteemed and WORSHIPPED as the Son of Christ.— Unless Shiloh come, every thing that Christ and the Apostles said is a lie: and Christ is an insufficient Saviour, by having predicted what has not been fulfilled.” These, as nearly as I can recollect, were some of the expressions employed. In going out, the congregation experienced a slight zest of persecution from the lowest and most profligate of the London canaille: one poor old lady was followed, as being mistaken for Joanna; and the preacher himself, Mr. Turpin, who had told us that Satan was about to lose his pudding, escaped with difficulty into the Oxford Arms. No doubt they considered all this as the beginning of troubles, as distress of nations with perplexity.

ciful plans for abolishing all civil government, and regenerating the world, the ANTINOMIANS as-

Now these persons professing to abide by the Liturgy, say in the Te Deum—"also the Holy Ghost, the Comforter." But this preacher distinctly told us that Shiloh, the son of Joanna, is the Comforter promised by Christ to his disciples. It therefore follows that Shiloh, this child, is the Holy Ghost. But the Holy Ghost is God. Shiloh then is God. Joanna Southcott therefore is pregnant with— Omnipotent Father! there is horror and blasphemy in the very thought!

The time originally fixed for the miraculous birth of Shiloh, was the latter end of harvest; but one of their preachers, I have heard, has contrived to prolong the period, having dexterously extricated himself from the difficulty by saying he had alluded to the harvest in the NORTH.

The chief books relating to the principles of this sect are "The strange Effects of Faith," in five parts; "What Manner of Communications are these?" "The Trial," "The Five Books of Wonders," with a prodigious number of other pamphlets, all written by the prophetess herself; and the publications of Hann, Lane and Pomeroy, Carpenter, Hearn (curate of Brixton, Devon), Brice, and Besley, against her.

For these two months past, all the editors of newspapers have taxed their wits, to keep up this subject, only for want of a better. A postman is said to have observed, that the woman is sealed, but not delivered; an engraver, that her seals make no deep impression; a midwife, that the story is beyond conception, and past bearing; while a magistrate declared, (would that his joke had been a practical one!) that she would never be in the straw, till she were brought to the house of correction. In the mean time, the chapel in Duke's Place, with its environs, having been a field of continual disturbance, it has been closed for a time by direction of the magistrates. On the opposite side of the metropolis, crowds have continu-

serted, with an unprincipled daringness, that the obligations of morality had ceased on the intro-

ally beset the mansion of the prophetess herself; and their annoyance has induced her to take flight, accompanied by Underwood, on Friday, 26th August; a day which will ever stand recorded in the annals of the sealed, as the epoch of a second Hegira. Whatever may be intended, or whatever may prove the result, I foresee that this delusion will not easily be suppressed. People are not aware of the extent to which it has already spread itself. Had Mahometanism, had Quakerism, nay, had Methodism itself, a much more promising beginning? When I find that six medical men out of nine, have declared this impostor to be pregnant at the advanced age of sixty-four, and that others gain favour for her by denying her to be an impostor; that 14,000 have been sealed; that 8000 have signed; that disciples abound in every English county; that five chapels of the sect are erected near the metropolis; that the deception is sanctioned by wealth, respectability, and even intelligence; and that, O shame! five clergymen of the Established Church are numbered among the sealed people; I conceive the time for the policy of silent contempt to have passed by, and the season for open argument to have arrived; and I trust I shall not be condemned in making this humble attempt to stem the tide of a growing delusion, and to lay open a system of blasphemy, imposture, and absurdity, the reception of which would have disgraced the darkest periods of society, and is almost incredible in an age of general intelligence.

I must add, in candour, that the chief Southcottian doctrines, and, in particular, the sealing, are by no means so unfavourable to holiness as has been generally rumoured and supposed. In the "Cautions and Instructions to the Sealed," the signet is set forth, as suspended, with respect to its efficacy, on the condition of yielding obedience to the divine laws. I have

duction of the Gospel ; that the beggarly elements of justice and humanity were abrogated, with the

already mentioned, that the sealing (which is *stated* to be free of expense) secures, as is believed, the enjoyment of the millenium, but that heaven may be obtained independently of this passport. The Southcottians profess to believe in the leading features of Christianity, although they diminish the glory of the second and third Persons in the Godhead. And while some, like Tozer, build chapels of their own, and others, like Mrs. Munday, have a church within them, the sect, in general, professes an alliance with the Establishment. I will add, that all the Southcottians with whom I have at any time conversed, are persons of most irreproachable morals in their several stations. In argument, I have found them reasoning with Christian moderation. In the tumult at Duke's Place, I saw them enduring reprehensible persecution in the spirit of Christian meekness.

A more respectable body of Millenarians assemble in the neighbourhood, under the ministry of Mr. Carpenter, who advances his doctrines in a chapel, entitled the House of God. Having conceived the House of God to be the tabernacle of the Southcottians, I had the pleasure of hearing this preacher without intending it ; and a more orthodox, sensible, judicious, temperate, liberal discourse, I have rarely heard in any church of the Establishment. The moral tendency was excellent, and the millenary doctrine touched upon was not stronger than many clergymen whose orthodoxy is undisputed, maintain. The whole Liturgy was used. The chapel is hung round, I cannot say adorned, with mystical pictures, connected with the principles of the sect. Satan bound in chains, mosaic pavements, crowns, fruit, the ship "Faith" landing passengers on the shore of heaven, and many figures in white robes, were to be seen among the subjects portrayed ; not certainly with the colours of Titian, the grace of Guido, or the grandeur of Rubens. Mr. Carpenter, I under-

other Mosaical institutions, and that the elect were only guided by an inward principle of faith; being set free from all restrictions on the perfect law of liberty.

As one extreme tends to generate another, the Popish doctrines of supererogation and meritorious virtues were opposed, in 1538, by John Agricola and Nicholas Armsdorf, the first Antinomian writers, who taught that the moral law is no rule of life to believers, that good works are mere accidents, like a man's stature or complexion, which neither promote nor hinder the matter of his salvation; that repentance is not to be preached from the Decalogue, but only from the Gospel; and that it is there described as consisting solely in implicit reliance on the imputed righteousness of Christ. In England, the sect worked up these opinions to the highest degrees of daring profligacy of sentiment; maintaining that the elect cannot possibly do any thing displeasing to

stand, was formerly a workman in a paper-mill; and as there are here great abundance of angelical figures, the paper-maker is yet, like a patten of bright gold, "QUIRING to the young-eyed cherubim." In truth, these daubs are wholly unworthy of his sense; but it is necessary, perhaps, to mark the distinctive tenets of the denomination. He railed most vehemently against Joanna and her crew, though not more harshly than she deserved; thereby proving the justness of Mr. Hume's remark, that the nearer any two sects approach in point of doctrine, the more violent is their mutual animosity.

God, and that consequently no sins, however monstrous, they could perpetrate, would at all impair or endanger their everlasting blessedness. In their case, they affirmed there was no occasion for repentance ; none for confession of sins. We have already stated that Crisp, Richardson, and Saltmarsh were the most respectable Antinomian writers in the time of Charles I.; others holding this profession, were Hussey, Eaton, and Town. It is idle to inquire what was the personal character of these preachers; and to no purpose do their admirers pretend that it was unexceptionable. The question is, what is the tendency, the immediate bearing of their doctrines? How are they likely, in general, to affect the minds of the common people? And in every breast, not thoroughly depraved, their mere statement can hardly fail to excite a shudder of alarm and horror. Though Calvinism, if strictly pursued, might perhaps lead logically to the borders of Antinomianism, yet Calvinism is comparatively harmless and admissible, when coupled with the belief that the same power who elects, bestows on his chosen such an extraordinary portion of his grace as shall render them capable of practising moral obedience. For, in this manner, good works are made the ultimate tests of election; and the existence of saving faith, without these fruits, is denied. But Antinomianism tends directly to make hypocrites and profligates.

Not many years after the appearance of Methodism in England, William Cudworth and James Kelly separated from Mr. Whitfield, proclaiming that the preaching of the law was an abomination; that they would have nothing to do with the LAW; that all who preached the LAW were legalists; and that, for their part, they would preach Christ, as they termed it, without one word of addition concerning holiness or good works.

I am afraid that language like this is held unwarily by many Calvinists, who are far in their hearts from insinuating such a meaning. I have myself heard it said, with a strong appearance of guarded teaching, that the Gospel did by no means abolish the moral law; but here was the grand and blessed doctrine; Christ fulfilled all that law in his own person. This, whatever may be thought of it, is virtual Antinomianism.

XXII. The chief congregations avowedly Antinomian, at present in this country, are those collected round the rostra of the late Mr. Huntington, in London; or planted by him in Leicester and Nottingham. William Huntington, alias Hunt, on account of the swearing of an illegitimate child, was born in the Weald of Kent, about 1753. He had a wretched education, and worked for many years as a labourer. At length he opened his mouth for the Lord, at which his master, "an Arminian of the Arminians, a Pharisee of the

Pharisees, was displeased." This man's idea of faith included the obtaining of temporal blessings; and, instead of being the substance of things hoped for, seemed the hope of things substantial. "If all things are possible with God, it is possible for him to send me to live as a servant boy with 'squire Cook." "In my hunger, I found a male partridge just killed by another male; I believe this battle between the plumed warriors was proclaimed by the Lord; for if a sparrow falls not to the ground without him, how should a partridge fall?" In short, he began to live by "the faith of the Lord for the supply of all his wants." He wished for a chapel, and God drew the pattern on a wise man's imagination, while hearing him preaching a sermon. A large ham, a bullock's tongue, two pieces of bacon, and a cheese, were all brought to him in the like compendious manner. Nay, having worn out a certain article of apparel, with frequent devotion on his knees, he received a new pair from a gentleman and his spouse. Surely this conversion of faith into Fortunatus's wishing-cap, is as unscriptural in doctrine, as it is delusive in experience: for, if any man work not, neither should he eat, 2 Thess. iii. 10; and, if any provide not for his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. 1 Tim. v. 8. The S. S. was also favoured with dreams and revelations. "In my dream, I thought I heard the Lord call to me with a very shrill, distinct voice, saying,

‘Son of man, son of man, prophesy!’ I answered, ‘Lord, what shall I prophesy?’ The voice came again, saying, ‘Prophesy upon the thick boughs.’ I immediately awoke, and felt a comfortable power in my heart, and thought the voice seemed fresh in my ears. I got up immediately, and traced my Bible, to see if I could find these words there; thinking, that, if I could, I should conclude the dream to be from God. I soon found the words, Ezek. xxxi. 3, and perceived the thick boughs to be men.”

This man, in life, was vulgar, dictatorial, and overbearing: and I am credibly informed, that no exhortations to the practice of any moral virtue were mingled in his wild, allegorical expositions of Scripture; unless the recommending of a subscription for a carriage to bring him to his own chapel, or for a pair of iron gates, to fence in the Tabernacle of Gray’s Inn Lane, might be deserving of that character. Yet such was the blind subservience and gullibility of the congregation, that the dictates of no Pope were received as more infallible than his: nor did ever Khan or Cæsar rule with more despotic sway.

William Huntington died, as he lived, a Pharisee: as witness the following epitaph, composed by himself, and erected over his grave at Jireh chapel in Lewes:—“Here lies The Coal-Heaver: who departed this life, July 1, 1813, in the 60th year of his age; beloved of his God, but abhorred

of men. The Omniscient Judge at the grand assize SHALL ratify and confirm this, to the confusion of many thousands; for England and its metropolis shall know that there hath been a prophet among them. W. H. S. S."

After his death, his moveables were bought up, like relics, with a more than Popish veneration. A plain chair, which he used to occupy, was purchased for 60*l.* and immediately resold for 100*l.* He has been succeeded in his Papal throne by a similar fanatic from Deptford, who, because Huntington added to his designation, the letters S. S. as denoting Sinner Saved, has imitated this classical thought, by assuming the characters M. G. to signify the Miracle of Grace.

To illustrate Mr. Huntington's influence over his people, and at the same time to exhibit a marvellous specimen of Antinomian morality, the truth of the following anecdote has never yet been denied. Let his friends deny it if they can. The chapel in Gray's Inn Lane was built by private subscription, to extend eastward those precious beams of new light, for which the environs of Titchfield Street were too narrow. A request was made to Huntington when the building was completed, that he would open it for divine service, by preaching the first sermon. "Yes," said he, "provided that the whole concern shall have been first of all conveyed over to me, without reserve, as in every sense my freehold property,"

This disinterested proposal was no sooner made, than actually executed by these beneficent chapel-builders: for what will not men do to be assured of that inestimable doctrine, that a short and easy cut is open to heaven by faith, without the circuitous and laborious services of a beggarly obedience? But mark the purity and sincerity of this Antinomian leader; who had no sooner become master of the edifice alluded to, than he affixed a tablet over the door, declaring that “This chapel was erected by William Huntington.” I ask, does not this stone remain there unto this day (July 25, 1814), a monument to all the world, that there has indeed been a SORT of prophet among them, speaking unto them smooth things, and prophesying and publishing a lie*?

The Huntingtonians hold the Calvinists in the utmost contempt; and their leader himself affirmed, that only one preacher in London, besides himself, spoke the genuine sentiments of the Gospel.

Luther, Rutherford, Sedgwick, Gataker, Witsius, Henry, Bull, Williams, Ridgley, Beart, Bellamy, Edwards, and Tomline, have all shown an earnest endeavour after obedience to be the proper fruit and genuine evidence of a right and saving faith. The Four Checks to Antinomianism

* What good end of public instruction can be answered by such sentences as the following:—“For three years Satan waylaid me in a path which I knew to be charity.”

by Mr. Fletcher of Madely, together with the third chapter of Bishop Tomline's work on Calvinism (which, by the way, is rather foreign to his subject), are unanswerable refutations of this heresy*.

The twelfth Article of our church appears to be a just illustration of the scriptural doctrine respecting faith and obedience: "Although good works cannot put away our sins, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ; and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith is known, as a tree by its fruits."

That they cannot obliterate sin, or endure the severity of God's judgment, every man bears a witness within his breast sufficient to convince him: or if this be liable to perversion, he has a

* See Fuller's edition of Hannah Adams's *View of Religion*, Bull's *Harmonia Apostol.* and Williams's *Gospel Truth*; Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 320; Clark's *Lives*, p. 142; Crisp's *Sermons*, Eaton's *Honey Comb*, Saltmarsh on *Free Grace*, Huntington's *Bank of Faith*, Edwards on *Religious Affections*, and Adam's *View of Religions*.

See also Mr. Huntington's "Forty Stripes save none, or the Devil whipped with Rods;" "The Rule and the Riddle, or, an Addition to the everlasting Task of slumbering Watchmen and old Women;" and, above all, that beautiful flight, "The Music and Odour of the Saints." If by the saints are here meant the Huntingtonian congregation, I most sincerely hope that both their music and their ODOUR are somewhat better than I once experienced them to be in Providence Chapel.

further assurance in the words, "If thou, Lord, shouldst be severe to mark what is amiss, who should stand?" and again, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." But that works, though not meritorious, are necessary to faith, appears from Ephes. ii. 10, "God created us in Christ Jesus, unto good works;" and Rom. ii. 6, "Who will also render unto every man according to his works." In the former passage, they are the object of our conversion; in the latter, the terms on which we shall be rewarded or punished. That a pretended faith independent of good works is no faith at all, is clear from James, ii. 17, 18: "Faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." "In Christ Jesus, faith, which worketh by love, availeth." Galat. v. 6. "To do good and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. xiii. 16, 20, 21. "Now the God of peace, &c. make you perfect in every good work, &c. which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ." If good works, therefore, be thus pleasing in his sight, the absence of them must be positively displeasing; and how can men call themselves the chosen vessels of God, when they do what is displeasing to him, with daring deliberation?

Worthy and well-meaning Christians sometimes

approach the verge of Antinomianism, through an honest desire to resist the self-righteous reliance placed by the proud and pharisaical on their own deservings; conceiving any mention of works in the matter of salvation, to be a dishonour to the merits of the Saviour. But surely such persons will do well to deliver their sentiments in an extremely guarded manner; lest they break down the barriers of moral obligation, stifle the voice of conscience, teach the sinner to reconcile a bold and deceitful sense of security, and hope of divine favour, with a hardened continuance in his iniquities; and render Christians forgetful of the important truth, that Christ Jesus gave his life in order to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

XXIII. Another family of enthusiasts were the MUGGLETONIANS, or followers of a pair of tailors, Muggleton and Reeves, who conceiving a fancy to exchange the shop for the sounding board, gave themselves out as the last witnesses mentioned in the book of Revelations. These two REMNANTS of testimony and portions of a preacher disapproved of every species of ministry, saving of course *their own*, and denied the existence of the prince of darkness. It seems evident from this sample of their important annunciations to the world, that they would have acted more prudently in continuing to drive a thread through the eye of a needle,

than in attempting to lead the way to the kingdom of heaven.

As the Muggletonians thus denied the existence of a devil, the great minister of future punishment, the Hattemists were resolved to rise to no less exalted a flight, by declaring that there was nothing, in fact, to be punished. They denied the corruption of human nature, and the distinction betwixt moral good and evil; and hence inferred that men were under no manner of obligation to amend their lives and obey the divine commandments. God, they thought, did not punish men for their sins, but BY their sins; and therefore the sum of Christianity consisted in suffering all the evils of life with a permanent tranquillity of mind. *These*, with several other ephemeral sects, not worthy of notice, sported their short hour in the days of the Protectorate. As there is not now a Muggletonian or a Hattemist left in England, we may disdain to war with the shades of these inglorious antagonists. To deny the existence of punishment in the world to come, or to exclude moral obligation from a religious creed, is most comfortable doctrine for a congregation of profligates; but all such comfortable doctrine should be suspected on account of its comfortableness. To deny is not to disprove; and if those who act up to the principles of Messieurs Muggleton and Hattem should chance,

after all, to be mistaken, it happens somewhat unfortunately that they will open their eyes upon the truth, when it will be too late to have made the discovery.

XXIV. When the tailors Muggleton and Reeves thus failed in their attempts to put a new patch upon a garment which required it not, a far more honourable destiny awaited the preaching of a shoemaker of Nottingham, who, about the same time, forsook his awl to teach a new form of religion.

This man, George Fox, A. D. 1650, instituted the sect denominated Quakers. In narrating their own history, they state, that in the beginning of the 17th century, many persons conceived the recent settlement of the church, under Queen Elizabeth, to be imperfect, and even the dissenters to have retained many formalities and observances contrary to a true reformation, and to a pure and spiritual worship. Hence the more enlightened, withdrawing themselves from public communion with all such ill-regenerated societies, wrapped themselves up in contemplation, and sought the Lord in the shades of retirement. Eminent in this class was that honourable elder Fox, who having been himself quickened by the immediate touches of divine love, directed his brethren where they might find the like consolation. But though Fox refused communion with

other religious societies, he frequently, with violent zeal, intruded himself into their meetings, with the view of inveighing against their abominations. If by such intemperance he seemed to invite and court persecution, it must be owned that the spirit of the times did not suffer him to be disappointed. Every man's hand was lifted up against him; and even the Protector, so indulgent to all other persuasions, was no protector of the Quakers. Fox, during his itinerant labours, publicly opposed a preacher who had asserted that the more sure word of prophecy, mentioned 2 Peter, i. 19, was none other than the Scriptures; while his opponent maintained it to be the inward teaching of the Spirit. For this outrage he was cast into prison at Nottingham, and being brought, in the following year, before two justices in Derbyshire, he desired them, with an audacious contempt of court, to tremble at the word of the Lord: on which one of them, Gervas Bennett, termed his party Quakers*.

* Fox was a deluded fanatic, wandering from county to county, spending whole days in the hollow of a tree, and imagining himself gifted with prophecy and the power of working miracles†. Clarkson, in his *Portraiture*, denies the story of the leathern doublet; and Ellwood, the Quaker, says, "Fox was deep in divine knowledge, powerful in prayer, sound in judgment, &c." All sensible men, however, consider him as a melancholy fanatic. Fox declared he was forbidden by

† See *Christian Observer*, 1813, Review of Tuke's *Faith of the Quakers*.

They themselves, however, alleging the primitive example of 3 John, 14, have adopted the title of

God to take off his hat to men. About 1649, many visionaries imitated him; and women, glad to embrace a religion which permitted them to harangue, entered what they called steeple-houses, during the time of service, and jealously decried the teaching of men†. To be agitated by convulsive motions, was common to all these visionaries; but the name of Quaker would now be ill applied to their successors, who are all immoveable as a gallery of statues. It is not surprising, that even a tolerant government should formerly have regarded them as disturbing the peace of the country, and on that account deserving of being watched and restrained; for they every where termed ministers hirelings, false prophets, deceivers of the people; they interrupted the public service; they declared against places of worship, and the observance of the Sabbath; they appeared in habits covered with allegorical representations of some impending calamity. In instruction they rested little on the grand doctrines of original sin and redemption; but turned the attention of men to a Christ within them, who seemed to preclude the acknowledgment of a Redeemer without. In 1654, the first meeting of the Friends, in London, was held at a private house in Watling Street; they afterwards assembled at the Bull and Mouth Inn.

About this time, whatever Mr. Clarkson may affirm to the contrary, a female Friend appeared naked in Whitehall Chapel‡; and a person with a drawn sword, pretending a commission, wounded several members of Parliament. Mr. Hume, however, for the sake of stage effect, has given a very false representation of the story of James Naylor. This enthusiast had been an officer in Lambert's troop, an admired

† See Coote's *Mosheim*, vol. v. p. 467; More's *Mystery of Godliness*, b. x. ch. 13.

‡ *Mosheim*, vol. v. p. 470.

Friends; although, in public addresses, and in ordinary dealings, they are content to appear under the modest designation of—the People called Quakers. At the Restoration, Keith and Fisher, men of learning and abilities, and soon afterwards William Penn, reduced Quakerism to a systematic form *. The Friends, in the infancy of their sect, were molested in their simple worship; but though they suffered persecution in the reign of Charles II. they allow that that monarch discountenanced the severities of the Parliament. They

speaker, and a man of good natural endowments. He certainly permitted divine honours to be paid him on entering Bristol, being preceded by a multitude strewing their garments in the way, and exclaiming, “Hosannah to the Sun of righteousness.” But it is not true, that to every question proposed to him, after his apprehension, he replied only, “Thou hast said it.” On the contrary, there appears to have been much method in his madness. He defended himself under the charge of permitting worship to be paid him, by declaring, that he deemed it offered entirely to the Christ within him. “For myself,” said he, “as a frail creature, I abhor earthly honours; but I receive them as a sign, and I had authority from God to receive them.” Naylor endured persecutions with obstinate inflexibility. When he was whipped, branded in the forehead, and bored in the tongue, his followers licked his wounds. But hard labour, and meagre fare, in Bridewell, brought him to his senses, and produced an acknowledgment of sorrow for his blasphemies.

* For an account of the life and writings of Barclay, see the General Dictionary. Sewell, in his History, gives an ample account of Keith. Fisher is particularly mentioned in a German work, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*.

admit also, that Penn was a favourite with James II. and speak with grateful acknowledgment of the acts passed in their behalf during the reigns of William and Mary and of George I.

The Quakers abound chiefly in England, Ireland, and America; their system seeming too grave for French volatility, and too plain for the voluptuous climates of the south*. They have monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, for the admission of members, the censure of transgressors, the settlement of differences, the education of their children, the care of the poor, the registry of births and burials, and, though last, not least, the allowance of MARRIAGES†. The yearly, or spring meeting, is, in particular, a grand pairing time: it is the races, the assize week, the county meeting, and the watering-place of the Quakers. The legislature indulges them in their objection to the solemnization of marriages by ministers of the Established Church. Matrimony is performed in their meeting-houses, by a declaration of the two parties of their consent to live with each other in the state of wedlock. The Quaker women, being admitted to the ministry,

* Their numbers in England and Wales are computed at 50,000; in Scotland at not more than 300.

† In the meetings there is no president; the wisdom of God being thought alone fit to preside. All labour is undertaken gratuitously, except, perhaps, the extra diligence of a single clerk.

and elevated in the scale of estimation, have monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings of their own, though without the power of making laws. The great care taken of the poor of this society, has been attributed, and perhaps with justice, to the attention of their amiable females to that department of religion*.

At Ackworth, a few miles from Pontefract, in Yorkshire, the Friends have a highly respectable and well-conducted school, the erection of which was chiefly promoted by Dr. Fothergill, to whose memory it is a noble monument. Here about a hundred and eighty boys, and a hundred and twenty girls, are educated at a wonderfully moderate expense. Among other excellent regulations, no difference is allowed among the pupils in point of food, accommodation, pocket-money, or other indulgence, how various soever may be the circumstances of their parents.

It is well known that Penn received from Charles II. a tract of land in America, in lieu of arrears due from government to his father, the admiral of that name. Not, however, conceiving himself to be invested with a right, which should supersede the prior possession of the natives, he summoned a council of their princes, and purchased from

* The seven yearly meetings are those, 1. of London, having representatives from Ireland; 2. New England; 3. New York; 4. Pennsylvania and New Jersey, &c.; 5. Maryland; 6. Virginia; 7. Carolinas and Georgia.

them so much territory as suited his immediate need. This land has been since extended by similar purchases, and is known by the name of Pennsylvania. Penn, as he enlarged his dominion (for he may be regarded as a species of monarch), ruled with a truly Christian sway. No sword was unsheathed for war; no steel was whetted for persecution. Penn's chief publication was entitled, "The sandy Foundation shaken *."

Associated with Penn, in the patronage of Quakerism, was Barclay, the author of the celebrated Apology †. In this work the Quaker principles are systematically laid down in fifteen theses, which are still generally received as "the standard of their doctrine, and the test of their orthodoxy ‡."

* Many of the American Quakers held strange notions respecting the Trinity, affirming, that Christ never existed except in the hearts of the faithful. This occasioned the controversy in which George Keith distinguished himself. Burnet's History of his own Times, vol. ii. p. 249; Rogers's Christian Quaker; and, The Quakers a divided People.

† Ancestor of Captain Barclay, the ποδας οκυς.

‡ See Penn's Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers; Sewell's History of the Quakers; Rutt's History; Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends; Bevan's Refutation of the Misrepresentations of the Friends; Barclay's Apology, and Helton's Defence of ditto; Phipps on Christian Baptism; Clarkson's Portraiture of Quakerism; Clarkson's Memoirs of Penn; Tuke's Faith of the Quakers; Besse's Defence of the Quakers.

On the other hand, Brown's Quakerism the Path to Paganism; Voltaire's Letters on the English Nation; Cræsi

It were unjust to the Quakers to omit speaking with warm applause of their great liberality in encouraging public charities. Wherever a society is instituted for diffusing knowledge throughout the world, or for improving the bodily comforts of mankind, the society of the Friends are ever prompt to support it, without regard to religious distinctions. They have a committee in America for civilizing the Indian natives: their voice has been ever raised against the nefarious traffickers in human blood. In England they contribute to charities peculiar to the Church Establishment; and this evidently without sinister motives of any kind, which is more than can be said, perhaps, for some others among the sectaries.

XXV. Of the fifteen propositions laid down by Barclay, some are strictly orthodox, and others objectionable. The Quakers believe in a Trinity in unity—in the fall of man—his redemption by Christ—the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, and the obligation of the moral law; so

Hist. Quakeriana tribus Libris comprehensa; Voltaire, *Mélanges de Littérature*; Le Clerc, *Biblioth. Univ.* tom. xxii. p. 53; Leslie's *Snake in the Grass*, and other works, have been written in opposition to the Quaker system.

Some of the Quakers in America have manifested an attachment to Socinian principles; and a female preacher, on account of inculcating them, was there recently silenced. But these sentiments are wholly disowned by the great body of Friends.

that in the great lines of doctrine their faith is strictly consentaneous with that of the purest Protestant churches. But let us consider the propositions in their order, commenting upon each as we go along.

The first is a postulate, or general truth, to which all denominations of Christians will, of course, accede. It acquaints us, that since the height of happiness is to know God, the first thing to be sought is the foundation of this knowledge.

2. On this right basis, however, has been reared a superstructure of error. And even to the next point, which, while it teaches that it is by the Spirit that God is revealed to us, subjoins, that the inward revelations of the Spirit are not to be subjected to the testimony of Scripture, as to a touchstone, very strong objections are to be urged*.

God, in his written word, hath told us the very reverse of this: "Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they are of

* The older Quakers were mystics; and their singularities arose from the mystical principle of a ray of divine light, which was held to be innate in each bosom, and which was to be kindled and drawn forth by contemplation and abstraction. The modern Quakers confound this innate light with the operations of the Holy Spirit upon the souls of the faithful. All their leading particularities, however, might easily be still traced to the old mystical principle. Every maxim supposes the light within, and the necessity of abstracting the mind from those grosser enjoyments, and distracting cares, by which it might be overwhelmed and quenched.

God ; because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John, iv. 1). Nay, the word of God has laid down to us the canon of judgment ; and thus, in the trial of every claim to spiritual illumination, subordinated to itself the inward conviction of the claimant. " Beware of false prophets, &c. Ye shall know them by their fruits" (Matt. vii. 15, 16).

To a want of reference to this great standard it is, that the extravagances of most fanatics, and the blasphemies of Fox himself, are to be traced. We say blasphemies ; for in his book, entitled, " News coming out of the North," p. 15, he says of himself, " I am the door that ever was ; the same Christ yesterday, to-day, and for ever." And again, in the introduction to his Battledore for Teachers and Professors, he says, " All languages are to me no more than dust, who was before languages were." That these pretended secret revelations require some outward corrective, is now indeed practically admitted by the Friends themselves, in their appointment of elders, to judge and decide respecting their genuineness, in those who seek the office of teaching in the meetings.

3. The third proposition is a converse, or amplification of the second. " We admit," say the Quakers, " the divine origin of Scripture ; we hold that the Sacred Writings are able to make men wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. iii. 15). We reverence the

precepts of Scripture; deeming them excellent, practicable, and binding; but we deny them to be the principal ground of truth and knowledge; or the adequate primary rule of faith and manners. They are a secondary and subordinate rule: the revelations of the Spirit to us, are to be considered as the first rule*."

In endeavouring to refute these tenets, we are encountered at first, with one most perplexing difficulty. Shall we appeal to Scripture? The Quakers own a higher tribunal. Shall we ground our reply in reasoning? An inward light, superior to it, is pretended. Our observations, therefore, are addressed, rather as a caution to those who may feel inclined to this mystical persuasion, than as an attempt to proselytize any, who, in bowing to its dominion, have bidden defiance to both reason and Scripture.

In denying the Scriptures to be the primary or

* See Barclay's Apology; Buck's Theolog. Dict.; Mosheim; Adams; Christian Observer, Review of Clarkson's Life of Penn, 1813; Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends, 8th edit. Lond. Philips.

"Immediate revelation has not ceased; a measure of light being given to all men, sufficient for the working out of their salvation, unless resisted. This light is not less universal than the seed of sin, and saves those who have not the OUTWARD means of salvation: and it is a divine principle, in which God, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, dwells; which the Scriptures call, 'Christ within, the hope of glory' †."

† Gregory, Church Hist.

sole standard of faith, and representing them as inferior to a certain inward light in the bosom of every individual, the Quakers destroy all positive certainty in regard to doctrine. On this hypothesis, every man may entertain a separate body of opinions, different in some points from those of his brother ; and there will be no acknowledged rule to which these discordant pretensions can be referred. “ No,” says the Friend, “ it is the Spirit who guides individuals, and the Spirit cannot mislead.” But if any two Christians, suppose both of them Quakers, differ on any speculative point (and with respect, at least, to the extent to which amusements may be carried, we very well know, they will differ), this argument refutes itself ; for might not they, who, to use a coarse though common phrase, are termed “ Wet Quakers,” who have clipped the rotundity of their hats, dropped the TUTOYING pedantry, and witnessed a rational drama (characters, many among whom are of irreproachable morals), reply to their stricter brethren : “ By what right do you exclude us from your society ? the same inward light by which you are influenced, acquaints us, that in using greater latitude in dress and discourse, we are not doing what is wrong.” How is such a difference to be settled ? Not by an appeal to Scripture, if the Quaker system be admitted ; for that were an appeal downwards from the infallible to the less certain authority.

What was the grand and simple principle of Protestantism, allowed in common by the leaders of the Reformation? Was it not, that the Bible should be referred to as the standard of doctrine? What was the general complaint against the church of Rome? Was it not, that it demanded respect for traditional authority, and imposed articles of belief not warranted by the Sacred Records? While all other denominations of reformers, then, however differing in sentiment, the Calvinist and the Socinian, the Independent and Episcopalian, agree in appealing to the Scriptures as the test of their opinions, and only accuse each other of not interpreting these Scriptures rightly; the Quakers establish a paramount authority to that of the Bible, depart from the general principle of the Reformation, and revert to that species of error, of which all the reformers complained, as the root of corruptions in the Romish church.

That the Scriptures ought to be acknowledged as the ultimate standard of religious opinion, may be proved from the following passages: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, &c. *"
—"That the man of God may be PERFECT; thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other

* 2 Tim. ch. iii. ver. 15, 16, 17.

Gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed, &c. *"

In setting up an inward revelation of superior authority to Scripture, the Quakers dishonour Scripture. They fling a stone of imputation at its veracity. Scripture is a revelation to be received by faith, as equally certain with any that might be INFALLIBLY whispered to the mind. To reduce it, then, beneath that which we only IMAGINE to be whispered to the mind, is to appeal from faith to supposition; from what ought to be assurance, to what is, at the best, but fancy; to what the Quakers themselves acknowledge MAY BE fancy, in appointing judges to examine the qualifications of candidates for the office of teaching in their meetings.

There is every reason to think, in opposition to the tenets of Quakerism, that immediate revelations have ceased, because the power of working miracles, the only certain test of extraordinary inspiration and assistance, has ceased. And, indeed, so far as we may presume to reason on the dispensations of Providence, the present state of the religious world appears not to require, that the same measure of preternatural aid should be bestowed on Christians, as the first disciples received.

Nec deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus

Inciderit,

may, with all reverence, be transferred from its

* Galat. i. 8, 9.

original application, to the dealings of the true God. Christianity had to struggle, in its infant years, with the pride of philosophy, the prejudices of Judaism, the superstitions of pagan worship, not less than with the interests of priests, and the power of magistrates, engaged in support of long-established systems. As the poor, simple, humble, unlearned fishermen of Galilee could not surmount obstacles so various and powerful, without the ability of working miracles; they can hardly be supposed capable of undergoing, with fortitude, the persecutions to which opposition, thus combined and determined, subjected them, unless endowed with an extraordinary afflation of divine succour. But as soon as Christianity had settled itself, or gained a footing in different countries, it is reasonable to suppose, nor are we warranted not to suppose, that this latter extraordinary aid was withdrawn along with the former; and for the same reason, namely, its being no longer necessary. Not that all spiritual aid whatever ceased with the cessation of miraculous gifts: for the depravity of nature is, and ever will be, far too commanding to be overcome by the power of man, unaided by supernatural influences. Besides, our Saviour declares, “Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world:” God is with us in his capacity of the third Person of the Trinity. But the aids of his grace are now measured out according to the existing necessities of

Christians. It is to the Son, alone, that God is affirmed not to have given the Spirit by measure. John, iii. 34. Unto every one of us is given grace, *according to the measure* of the gift of Christ. Ephes. iv. 7. Christians, therefore, are now endowed only with such aid as is needful; with that preventing, and that furthering help, which prompt, assist, and strengthen their own exertions and co-operations in holiness of living.

Of the *fourth, fifth, and sixth* of the propositions in the Apology, relating to man as fallen and depraved, to Christ as the salvation of believers, and to the universal benefit of this Redeemer's death, the doctrines are strictly orthodox. When it is asserted, however, that EQUAL benefits are undoubtedly derived, from the merits of Christ, by those who have never heard of him, as by those who have known him from their birth, the statement, thus unqualified, is contrary to reason, to Scripture, and to the practice of the Quakers themselves. It is adverse to reason; for, both in this world and the next, a higher degree of happiness will attend a purer morality, and the purest morality is known only to those to whom the Gospel is preached. It is adverse to Scripture; for, although it be right to admit, that men will not be condemned who act up to their imperfect light, yet salvation is represented generally in the nature of a covenant, of which faith is the bond on the part of man; and faith cometh by

hearing, and hearing by the word of God. Rom. x. 17. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved; how, then, shall they call on Him in whom they have not *believed*; and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? &c." Rom. x. 14. Lastly, this notion is opposed by the laudable zeal of the Quakers for the diffusion of Christianity; which would be superfluous expense and trouble, if the heathens were *precisely* under the same circumstances of advantages from the death of Christ, which they would enjoy in receiving the light of the Gospel. If this principle were strictly just, what would become of the societies for propagating Christian knowledge, for missions, for Bibles, for civilizing and christianizing the world? The truth would have been confined within the limits of Judea, and the Apostles might never have moved beyond the sea of Galilee. But, "Forsake your nets, and follow me; and go ye into ALL nations; and I will make you fishers of men."

"As many," says the seventh thesis, "as receive the light of the Spirit, in them is produced a holy birth, bringing forth holiness and purity, &c.; by which holy birth, as we are sanctified, so we are JUSTIFIED." By the work of the Spirit the man is, doubtless, born again; but neither this new birth, nor the fruits of it, justify him, seeing we are justified, or accounted just before God, by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The eighth thesis maintains the doctrine of PERFECTION, though qualified by the Quaker, as by the Methodist, with an admission, that decay is possible, and advancement necessary. As this doctrine is merely a speculative tenet, we shall only oppose to it a lamentable series of facts, consisting of the experience of all men from the beginning of the world. Point out the man who lives a single day in the world, without doing, saying, or thinking something, for which a delicate conscience would chide itself at night. To place an imaginary standard of perfection, or Christ, the real standard, continually before the eye of our minds, is consonant to the scriptural maxims, "Let us go on unto perfection," Heb. vi. 1; and, "Let the path of the just shine more and more unto the perfect day." Prov. iv. 18. It is, likewise, expedient in practice; for Herbert has well observed, that he who aimeth at the moon, though he will never reach it, is likely to shoot his arrow higher than another, who only directeth it at a tree. But to cherish a perpetual sense of our occasion for daily repentance, for continual remission, to feel our unworthiness, and to recline upon the Saviour, is, in compliance with the dictate of the same Scripture, to own ourselves unprofitable servants, and, while we do justice and love mercy, to walk humbly with our God. Luke, xvii. 10; Mic. vi. 8.

In the ninth proposition, the Calvinistic doc-

trine of final perseverance is denied. We have already expressed our cordial concurrence with the Friends, in reprobating an opinion so contradictory to reason and Scripture.

“As by the light or gift of God,” says the tenth proposition, “all spiritual knowledge is received; those who possess this gift are thereby sufficiently ordained to preach, though without human commission or literature; and any person of sober life, without distinction of sex, is allowed, and ought to preach, when moved by the Spirit.”

Now, we may ask, is it not one of the certainties established by universal experience, that religious knowledge, and the power of communicating it with propriety and effect, is only to be attained, like all other knowledge, not by instinct, not by immediate impression, but by a course of education and study? Facts must here stand in the place of reasonings. The Apostles, indeed, were inspired immediately with that power of utterance, and knowledge of divine truths, which effectually silenced and confuted the powerful, the eloquent, and the learned. God chose the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and breathed into them an unstudied wisdom for that express purpose. “Settle it, therefore, in your hearts not to meditate before what ye shall answer; for I will give you a mouth, and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist.” Luke, xxi.

14, 15. But we know, that if any man were now to try this experiment, his reasonings and language, under the ordinary assistance of grace, would be in exact proportion to the natural strength of his mind and quickness of his genius, improved by the different modes of study, by reading, thinking, discourse, and composition. Mr. Whitfield, it has been said, confidently expected, that, immediately on his arrival in America, he should be gifted with all the languages of the savage tribes. The Friends, themselves, act at present upon a conviction, that the unlettered are unfit to preach. Would they submit to the public instruction of a man altogether devoid of human education? At all events, it is well known, that before any one is permitted to speak publicly, he receives a certain kind of outward and human ordination, namely, the commission of the elders. It seems, then, that a particular body of Friends in a congregation, pretend to determine whether another Friend is moved by the Spirit, or not. Consider what is here admitted and supposed, first, that to feel a strong desire to preach, is not certainly to be moved thereto by the Spirit; and, secondly, that the candidate carries no infallible criterion in his own breast, whereby he may judge as to the genuineness of his impulse. But if the question be thus difficult of decision even to the person himself who courts the privilege of public teaching, how can his judges be infallibly certain that

they are moved in this investigation by the Spirit? How can they pronounce, but by those ordinary, human criteria, which are perfected in the church establishment, and the admission of which destroys the whole system of self-commissioned teaching, namely, an examination of the intellectual and moral qualifications of the candidate *?

Religion, upon the whole, is a branch of knowledge; and, in the general division of labour, a body of men should be separated from the distraction of other occupations, in order to qualify themselves for becoming instructors. Here, as in trades, or civil professions, they should learn their business; they should pass through an apprenticeship, or course of preparation. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*, might have been said to George Fox; and the writer of these pages might as well attempt to cobble a shoe, as Dr. Last to preach in the hope of his acquitting himself with propriety, and to the real edification of his hearers.

Without here contending that the Levitical institutions afford a model which Christians are obliged to follow, we may at least affirm, that, from an attention to them, the mind of Infinite

* In private meetings, all are permitted freely to display their gifts: but some among them appear not to be abundantly endowed with the riches either of sense or taste. At the funeral of a Quaker in Lancashire, a female Friend commenced her discourse with the following pathetic exordium: "Man's extremity is God's opportunity."

Wisdom, on certain subjects of high importance, can be gathered. Now, a distinct order of men were set apart for the Jewish priesthood. As to a commission to preach, we know that Christ appointed the twelve, and afterwards sent forth the seventy, to teach in every city. "No man taketh this honour upon himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Heb. v. 4. Will any self-constituted teacher pretend, that his inward call is equal in authenticity to that of Aaron?

Next, with respect to the Quaker doctrine of inward ordination by the Spirit, it may be observed, that the Apostles ordained by outward forms, by prayer and imposition of hands. Acts, vi. 6, and xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; and 2 Tim. i. 6.

It only remains, on this head, to say a few words respecting the preaching of females; and St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, settled this point long ago. 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak," &c.: and again, "For it is a shame for women to speak in the churches." Let it be remembered, that a Quaker accounts every house, where worship is offered, equally sacred; every religious meeting equally a church. But a fair orator, perhaps, will tell us, that the inward light is superior to the dead letter of Scripture. Yet it is somewhat strange, that not one of the Apostles was a female; that

not one of the seventy was a female: how comes it, that there is not a single instance in the whole New Testament, of a female preacher, moved by an inward impulse, contradicting this plain and positive direction of Scripture?

Having learned, that all persons are permitted to teach, we are told, in the eleventh thesis, that all true and acceptable worship is offered to God by the inward and immediate working of the Spirit; and, therefore, that there are neither times nor places for worship; but men must worship where and when they are moved by the Spirit. All worship, which a man can begin and end at his pleasure, is superstition, will-worship, and abominable idolatry*.

To this let us answer, first, that, admitting it to be will-worship, may not the Spirit of God influence the will? Did not God give the Jews particular hours, and a particular place, for prayer and sacrifice? A man, it is true, may and ought to lift the heart to God, whenever and wherever he is prompted. But did not Christ prescribe to his disciples the Lord's prayer? May they not begin and end it when and where they please? and will a Quaker presume to call their doing so, superstition and abominable idolatry? Or, admitting that they are moved to prayer by the Spirit, may not the Spirit move them to pronounce the

* See Christian Observer, Sept. 1813.

most perfect form that ever was composed? But have not Quakers both a place and a time for assembling to worship? and does not a signal from an elder, intimate that the hour of worship has elapsed? The servant of God may, at times, be disinclined to pray; and experience shows, that if prayer be not habitual and regular, this disinclination increases. We should, therefore, daily, at the throne of grace, beseech the Spirit of God to keep alive within our breasts the flame of inclination to prayer.

Baptism is affirmed, in the twelfth proposition, to be, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God. The Quaker, therefore, allows not of sprinkling by water. But how he can get over the examples of Cornelius, who was baptized in water; of the Ethiopian, who descended with Philip into the water; and of our Lord himself, who submitted to the rite of baptism in Jordan; he has never condescended to show. "Except a man be born of WATER, and of the Spirit," said our Lord to Nicodemus, John, iii. 5, "he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." To suit the Quaker hypothesis, the phrase should run, "Except a man be born of water, THAT is, of the Spirit;" or "water" should not have been mentioned at all. If baptism were exclusively inward, it would be the work of the Holy Ghost, acting immediately on the individual baptized. No other

MAN could have any concern in it. How comes it, then, that Christ commanded his Apostles, "Go ye into all nations, and do YE baptize them?" Matt. xxviii. 19.

As to the passage, declaring baptism to be not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience to God; the Quaker perverts its meaning. It pronounces, that the outward form is not the WHOLE of the sacrament; "Ergo," says the Quaker, "there must be no outward form at all." Now, we are elsewhere told, that the kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink. Rom. xiv. 17. By the above rule, then, men who seek it, ought neither to eat nor to drink at all.

Some Quakers, indeed, affirm, that this rite was prescribed and practised, as suitable to the early periods of Christianity, but that it was only commanded for a time. But by what passage in Scripture do they support so bold an opinion? "Go ye, and baptize ALL nations." The commandment is valid, until all nations be converted.

In the next proposition; the other sacrament is dismissed with equally little ceremony. As baptism is a purification of the heart, the Lord's Supper is a concord of souls. "The communion of the body and blood of Christ is but a shadow: it ceases in such as have the substance." But, unfortunately for this explanation, the communion of the Lord's Supper is not a prospective, but a

commemorative rite. "Do this in REMEMBRANCE of me." Luke, xxii. 19. Men remember a thing not before, but usually AFTER it happened. Nor will it serve the purpose of the Friends, to affirm that THIS rite was commanded only for a season. "As OFTEN as ye shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death until he come." 1 Cor. xi. 25. What can this mean but the continuance of the act of remembrance, until the Lord's second coming, to judge the world? Why should the office be appointed only for a season? and at what season ought it to cease? If the sacrament of bread and wine was instituted to keep up the memory of the precious death of Christ, the observance becomes even the MORE necessary, as the fact waxes the less recent; for monuments are reared and medals are struck, as standing records of facts to late posterity.

"That no man has a right to force the consciences of others," is the penultimate proposition, and has, of course, our cordial approbation. The last denies the lawfulness of salutations, compliments, titles of honour, and, in general, of all vain speeches, and of oaths in courts of justice. It forbids bows, and the uncovering of the head; superfluities in dress, and sportive or idle amusements.

Concerning all these, we must speak in due order. And first, as to flattering words and titles,

and to the use of You, instead of Thou. Are not titles of respect observed to have been bestowed, by the best characters, both in the Old and New Testaments? Jehoiada, and his sons, said, "God save the king," 2 Kings, xxiii. 11. "King Agrippa," said Paul, "believest thou the prophets?" Acts, xxvi. 27. Whatever respect was conveyed by addressing a person as you, when it was first introduced, it is certain that "thou" has now become the title of greater respect; for that is most respectful which is reserved for rare occasions. And scriptural language has invested the "thou" with a certain peculiar reverence. A commoner, in addressing a sovereign or a peer, to avoid the impertinence of the familiar You, turns the phrase into the singular number, and accosts the person as a thing; Your Majesty, Your Lordship. If any pragmatical person were to say, Thy Majesty, Thy Lordship, the respect would, perhaps, be increased. So that, if the Quakers mean here to avoid a flattering compliment, they fall into the very error which they seek to shun. But I have heard another reason sometimes assigned for this affected phraseology. You implies two persons, while, in strict TRUTH, the Friend is addressing only one. This is merely a question of grammar; every man knows he is only one person when he is called, you, by another. But there is hyperbolical language to be found in Scripture, sufficient to condemn this trifling and punctilious minuteness.

“And there are many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.” John, xxi. 25.

But are such affectations intended to reduce men to an equality? or to remind them of their equality? If so, the scruple relates still merely to words. The Friends themselves employ domestic servants, whom they expect to make their fires, to clean their shoes, to wait on them at table, to perform all menial offices. Here is inequality in effect; here is the relation of master and servant, to all intents and purposes. Here is honour paid in action, by one person to another. And how there should be any hesitation in using the name, when the thing is practised, it is not very easy to conceive*.

These observations are applicable to the Quaker objection towards bowing and uncovering the head before superiors, and chiefly before the greatest of all superiors. They themselves receive honour of another in effect; wherefore, then, scruple at an external customary sign of it? Is not this

* Calling a man Mister, or subscribing one's self his humble servant, can be insincerity only as conceived to be such by the speaker or the hearer; but both know well, that the phrase is only a term of civility. But if the Quaker is so very precise, let him acquaint us where is his strict sincerity, in calling a stranger, nay, an enemy, “Friend.”

straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel? We are continually acting by signs; and, if there is any sin, it is not in the sign, but in the thing signified. We are composed of soul and body; our ideas are supplied through the medium of our senses; and, as long as we inhabit this earthly tabernacle, do what we will, signs will have a certain influence upon us. Let a man try to imitate anger by his gestures, and he will quickly find a sentiment of anger steal upon him. If he be admiring a beautiful picture or landscape, let him clasp his hands, or raise his eyes, and immediately that admiration will wax stronger. Suppose, then, the same person engaged in devotion, to uncover his head, and to fall upon his knees, will add humility and profound reverence to his adorings. Hence the Apostle commanded us to “glorify God in our bodies;” for they are the temples of God, and the vessels of his grace. Does the SPANIEL rejoice inwardly at his master’s return? Does he not testify his joy by his fawnings and his gestures? Do the feathered quire express their exhilaration in the opening spring, but by straining their little throats in melody? External homage, then, is the lesson taught by nature. But if the Quaker has attained such an height of spiritual abstraction, as that he feels equal religious veneration in sitting uncovered before God, and equal religious joy in not moving a muscle or a limb, with what he would

experience in laying aside his arrogant covering, and lifting up his hands and eyes to the great God and Father of the universe; let him, at least, forbear to wound the prejudices of his weaker brethren, who cannot fail to be shocked with such bold familiarity with the Deity. This was happily expressed by one of our old divines, who seriously, though quaintly, complained that a sect had recently sprung up, who seemed, by their external deportment, as if they wished to show that they were “Hail fellow, well met, with the Almighty *.”

“Every man, praying with his head covered,” says St. Paul, “dishonoureth his head,” 1 Cor. xi. 4; “but let the head of the woman be covered †.” The reason for both injunctions is plain. To uncover the head is the customary outward testimony of respect in men; but, in the softer sex, it yields to the superior duty of feminine delicacy.

These observations recommend, in an inferior degree, a man's standing uncovered before his earthly superiors.

With respect to bowing in adoration, is it not written, “O! come let us worship, and bow down, and kneel before the Lord our Maker?” Psalm xcv. 6. The woman with the issue of blood; Jairus; the man which had devils; Simon Peter; Mary, the sister of Lazarus, all fell down at the feet of

* Scattergood's Sermons.

† See also the following verses.

Jesus : and, whether we consider him in his divine or human capacity, the gesture enjoins, in the one case, the worship of the body to God ; and, in the other, the external signs of respect towards man. In this world we shall do well, in regulating our worship, to imitate the mode of adoration to be practised in the next. Now, the elders *fall down* before the Lamb. Rev. v. 8 ; and xix. 4.

The Quakers make a conscience of great particularity in dress. In dressing, it ought, doubtless, to be the chief object of a Christian to study that attire which shall court no notice whatever. The singularity of the Quakers' dress every where attracts notice ; and let the Friends of both sexes look well to their own hearts, whether this dress be not the effect, or this notice the cause, of pride. One hat differeth from another hat in magnitude ; but is there not danger lest this difference be but a difference in ostentation ; and thus, that the greater apparent glory of one hat, like the greater apparent glory of one star, as distinguished from another, may only prove the former to be nearer to the earth ?

The Quaker dislike to superfluities in dress would, nevertheless, in other respects, be worthy of all admiration, if we did not observe in the shops of Quaker milliners and haberdashers, no want of disposition to minister to the luxury of worldlings, by furnishing these superfluities which

they themselves consider as sinful. On this principle, I cannot see wherefore a procuress might not justify her criminal dealing, provided she took care to preserve her own chastity inviolate*.

If the Quakers, in their condemnation of games and sports, censure these amusements as occasioning a waste of time (and that seems the chief reason assigned by Barclay), recreations may be instanced, which are exposed to the same objection, and yet are certainly not criminal. “And there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and both Jesus was asked, and his disciples, to the marriage.” Here was displayed our Lord’s beginning of miracles, in changing water into wine. The first wonder wrought by our Saviour was designed to promote the innocent hilarity of an evening, in which time may strictly be said to have been wasted. In one sense, however, it was not wasted; but in that sense, neither is it wasted by a moderate use of games and other pastimes. The mind returns to its serious occupations, with renewed strength and spring, after moderate and innoxious relaxation. To enjoy, contentedly, the blessings and recreations of this life, and to lift

* To pursue the Quaker principle consistently, dress should only be employed for the homeliest accommodation of nature. A Quaker female has no tassels and fringes, no jewels and embroidery; but she has the costliest silks and muslins that can be procured. Therefore, let her abhor herself, and repent in sackcloth and coarse linen.

the heart in gratitude to the Giver of good, is to convert them into a means of grace. Cheerfulness is itself an act of religion : it is the emanation of a resigned, a placid, and a heavenly disposition. Even mirth, the broadest, in its season, is harmless, if it be unmingled with malice, and pass not into wild transports. A game is harmless in its season (for to every thing there is a time), if it involve not avarice, jealousy, cruelty, pride, contention ; if it banish not a sense of duty, and quench not the latent but living principle of religion. This is indeed the rule by which all recreations are to be tried. To the pure, all things are pure. If thou canst follow thine amusement, and not forget thy steadfastness, follow thy amusement. If thy mind be weak, and amusement creates in it a disrelish for the return to serious habits and to the duties of thy station ; be it sportive or grave, be it loud or noiseless, be it a game or not a game, to thee it is sinful.

St. Paul, in addressing the Corinthians, compares steadfastness in the Christian course to the exertions of these who “ run in a race.” The people of Corinth had been in the habit of witnessing the Isthmian games ; and therefore to them the comparison was happily proposed. But had St. Paul disapproved in every instance of this amusement, it is not very likely that he would have converted it into a similitude, or spoken of it without some disapprobation.

Quakers, says Mr. Clarkson, object to amusements as tending to disturb that stillness of mind which they deem essential to excellence of character. But arguments against being drunk with wine, are not arguments against a glass of wine. All pleasure is allowable which is not followed by pain or guilt; and many pleasures, consisting in interest moderately excited, may be participated without disturbing the permanent tranquillity of a well-regulated mind. There are certain virtues which belong to habits of excitement, and amiableness of character is incomplete without them. Not mine be the friend, who could meet without joy, part without a tear, or sympathize without ardour; who could tread over a parent's grave with placid and unmoved composure, or relieve the unfortunate from a cold sense of duty, and not out of the strong workings of an affectionate heart yearning towards an afflicted brother.

The Quakers object to oaths, and chiefly to swearing before a magistrate. To this we reply, that in the celebrated sermon on the Mount, which contains the words, "Swear not at all," we also find the expression, "Thou shalt not kill." But it cannot be pretended, that the arm of civil authority is hereby prohibited from executing justice upon evil doers; for in Rom. xiii. 4, we read, "If thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for the ruler beareth not the sword in vain." The ma-

gistrate therefore, who, for the advantage of society, punishes with death, may, to promote the same end, administer an oath. And what it is lawful to administer, it must be lawful to take.

In the Old Testament many passages, instead of prohibiting oaths, establish laws for the right use and observance of them: "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and shalt swear by his name." Deut. vi. 13. "Lord, who shall dwell in thy holy hill? even he that sweareth unto his neighbour, and disappointeth him not." Psalm xv. 4.

But lest it should be objected that these texts were penned before the bringing in of a better hope, let us advance our views to the Gospel.

There we find St. Paul breaking out into the apostrophes, "Would to God all were as I am!" "Behold, before God, I lie not: God is my witness that I make mention of you in my prayers." Acts, xxvi. 29; Galat. i. 20; Rom. i. 9. What shall be said of the example of our Saviour himself, who, when the High Priest charged him by the living God (the Jewish method of administering an oath), to declare whether he were the Christ, the Son of God; instead of reproving him for the solemn invocation, took the oath in effect, by replying, "Thou hast said." Nay, God the Father, as the Apostle relates, hath pledged himself by an oath to mankind: "Though it were impossible for him to lie, yet, that we might have

strong consolation and full assurance, he confirmed the immutability of his counsel by an oath ; and when he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself." Heb. vi. 17. "Do you, then," said Tertullian, "charge the Most High with perjury, or vain swearing?" Advers. Marcion. lib. 2, § 26.

Besides these leading opinions, there are one or two other peculiarities, by which the adherents of Quakerism are distinguished. They pronounce it unlawful for a Christian to resist evil. But if this maxim be established on a rigid observance of the letter of Scripture, why do the Friends stop short in their interpretation? They refuse to pay tithes, but permit the officer to take them ; and this they call persecution : but, on a principle of strict adherence to the letter of Scripture, they ought further to make a voluntary payment of double tithes : for, "if a man takes away thy cloak, give him thy coat also." Matt. v. 40.

On similar principles the Quakers think it inconsistent with the duty of a Christian to fight. Yet, when the soldiers demanded of the forerunner of Christ, "What shall we do?" he said unto them, not, "Lay aside your weapons," but, "Do violence to no man ; neither accuse any falsely ; and be content with your wages." Luke, iii. 14. And Cornelius, the first fruits of the gentile world, "was a centurion of the Italian band ;" nor do we find that prior to his baptism he was commanded to relinquish the military life. How

strange an inconsistency is a Quaker ! He will not strike ; but he will wound with the tongue. “ I will not beat thee,” said one of them to a vicious dog, “ but I will raise a bad report against thee.”

Joseph Lancaster will not flog a pupil, but he will hoist him up in a basket, and flog his mind.

The Quakers dislike music.

“ The man who hath not music in himself,
Nor is not mov'd with concord of sweet sounds ;
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus.”

Does a Quaker stop his ears when he hears a nightingale ? Does he remember, that, on the return of the prodigal, which has been chosen to describe the reception of a penitent offender, “ there was music and dancing within ; and that LIKEWISE there is joy among the angels, over one sinner that repenteth * ?”

* That there are some obscene and bacchanalian songs, is rather an argument for stopping the sense of hearing, than against learning music. A Quaker teaches his child to read, although he may meet with improper books †.

“ Either let the Quakers renounce all the enjoyments of this life, or take all that are innocent. The pursuit of wealth surely holds out a greater temptation to immorality, than the study of music. Let them disown those who accumulate more than is necessary for their subsistence, or permit those who have leisure, to employ it in something better than money-getting ‡.”

“ The ancient ascetics,” says the author of the article alluded to, “ acted consistently. They gave up every thing in this world, for the contemplation of a better. A modern

† See Edinb. Review, 1807.

‡ Ibid.

As to the calling Sunday the first day, and January the first month, and so forth, this is idle foppery. I might as well take it into my head to call Oxford Road the first street in my neighbourhood, or Hume's History the first book in my library. Words are the signs of ideas: and, provided there is no profaneness, does it signify a rush what these signs are? St. John called the first day, not the first day, but the Lord's Day. But affectation is to be shunned as a petty sin; and a Quaker, so extremely precise and captious in every thing, is as consummate a coxcomb as a Bond Street loungeur*.

I have thus brought to a close my long discussion of the principles peculiar to a sect, of whom it is but justice to add, that almost all their prin-

Quaker earns a large fortune, and employs it for self-gratification, in every way but the social and agreeable. He keeps an excellent table and garden; he is driven about in an easy chariot, but his plate must be without carving, and his chariot must be of a dusky colour. His guests may talk of oxen and broad-cloth; but wit and gaiety are entirely proscribed. His boys and girls are bred to bargaining and housekeeping; but when their bounding spirits are struggling in every limb, they must not violate their sedateness by a skip: and they would be disowned if they were to raise their innocent voices in a hymn to their great Benefactor †, &c."

* But, to speak of Saturday and January excites veneration for heathen gods. It is impossible to hear this stuff without laughing. Does any man think of Saturn or Janus when he makes an appointment?

† Review of Clarkson's Portraiture.

ciples are good rules carried to excess ; and that, whatever may be thought of their speculations now commented upon, there is much in their behaviour for all men to unite in admiring and imitating. In the simplicity of their speech, and manners, and apparel, let profaneness, insincerity, and vanity, receive an instructive lesson. Their aversion from waste of time in frivolous occupations, might lead us a little more up to the line of propriety, although they may go considerably beyond it. While religion and reason teach us to pay a decent submission to superiors, let us copy the plain dealing of the Friends, by a scorn of abject flattery. While we perceive the necessity for some ceremonies to aid the devotion of beings whose instructions enter, and whose affections are mainly engaged, through the channels of sight and hearing, let the silent adoration of the Friends remind us of this important doctrine, that “ God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit and in truth.” And well would it be, if all of every Christian denomination approached as closely to primitive practice as this inoffensive, amiable, and upright people ; should adopt their simple manners and pacific disposition ; beating their swords into instruments of husbandry, and learning the destructive and shocking arts of war and carnage no more *.

* The Quakers are, on principle, averse from law, and usually settle all matters of dispute by arbitration. It is said,

XXVI. Not long ago, while I was curate of Warrington, a new sect sprang up, engendered in that town by the enthusiasm of the Methodists upon the fanaticism of the Quakers, and denominating themselves Quaker Methodists, to signify their extraction on both sides. They had all the broad brims and the jockey bonnets, the demure looks and the stiff manners of the Friends; but having, unfortunately, dwelt at one time contiguously to their place of assemblage, I am quite ready to testify, that they had no silent meetings. Their assemblies, indeed, were scenes of the most horrible extravagance and uproar; uniting the Methodist vociferation with the Quaker universality of speak-

too, that they never affix a price on their goods, which is lowered in bargaining.

It was once remarked to me, and I believe it to be generally true, that a flourishing family of Quakers seldom continue attached to the sect beyond the third generation. The first obtains wealth; the second accumulates it; living in the enjoyment of some comforts, without many sources of expenditure. The third becomes impatient of the Quaker restraints: the hat is cut down, as a Jew clips a dollar to a half-crown; the coat is of a lighter shade and a newer cut; buckskins, or, as a certain prelate used to call them, profanes, are sported; now and then a novel is permitted to display its excitement; and very commonly a sly visit is paid to the house of Beelzebub. This is the phenomenon known in the world under the appellation of a Wet Quaker. He is the usual forerunner of a son who figures away at Bath and Newmarket; and who remembers little more of Quakerism, than to make a joke of baptizing his children.

ing. Here were mothers pinching their children to make them pray, till the poor little wretches squalled. Men, women, children, without distinction, order, or authority, all elevated their voices to the loudest strain of outcry and the wildest pitch of frenzy. I know not whether this miserable body of ignorant people still continue to flourish in their full-blown spiritual pride, and to disturb the whole neighbourhood with their demoniac yells. But until they shall give me a good reason why, agreeably to the direction of St. Paul, all things are not done by their society in order, I shall refrain from setting my foot within their cavern of the winds, or from arguing at greater length against their raving madness.

THE END OF VOLUME II.

D. Knodé 19
60

Grant, Johnson

A summary of the history of the English Church, and of the sects which
have departed from its communion with answers to each dissenting body on
its pretended grounds of separation
Bd.: 2

London 1814

H.eccl. 454 h-2

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10024956-1